

Alternative to Captain/FirstMate- Father knows bestA

8 upvotes | 25 January, 2015 | by theultmatecad

u/phantomdream09/ wrote me a very good question about why I would subscribe to RP subs and disagree with the Captain/First Mate dynamic.

I have posted my response below in the hopes of generating a discussion of this frameworks benefits/flaws.

I should begin by pointing everyone to the Rollo Tomassi post MUTINY which casts doubt on CAPTAIN/FIRSTMATE in a way I could never communicate.

Here is my response to why I feel CAPT/FIRSTMATE is not the best model for a LTR:

First of all-- let me thank you for your alternative viewpoint.

It may be helpful for other men to see that the Captain/First Mate arrangement ISNT a CORE template for RP relationships despite the fact that YOU think it is so.

However-- If it is "working" for you--then by all means you should continue. We don't change what is working well...

Ok..

Let me start by saying that first...your LTR or girlfriend, doesn't want to be your "First Mate". A strong male role (or CAPTAIN) is essential for the relationship to work. Assigning your SO the role of First Mate implies that YOU are assuring her that her voice will be heard, her input will be considered, because you love her so much.

You think you will be appreciated for "listening to her thoughts" and "including her"... You will not. This is left over Bluepill fantasy.

The Captain First Mate dynamic allows for "mutual frame". This is not a place for a LEADER as you have written about.

Women don't want to be TOLD that they're "being included". This is joke to women who already know they have the blameless option of abandoning or jumping the ship. Its the Captain who goes down right? I highly suggest you read Rollo Tomassi's MUTINY piece where he explains FAR better than I could how flawed the Captain/First Mate dynamic can be.

One day I will post a note about the framework that I use.

Its with me being Daddy-the wife and children are beneath me. This is where my wife prefers to be. She would never overtly admit this (even to herself)

Women will respond much better to a firm, sometimes nice, sometimes asshole father figure than a self promoted captain looking for her input when she shares ZERO consequences for failure

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

UEMcGill • 7 points • 25 January, 2015 09:27 PM

I'm a firm believer in the Captain/FO model.

One argument against it I think misses the point is that "you seek her input to make her happy". I think this totally mis-represents the analogy. No the Captain is 100% responsible for the mission. It's his prerogative to set the direction of the ship. The first officer role is that as a Real Good Woman, it's her duty to support the mission. It's your job as captain to let her know what the rules of engagement are and how to move forward.

To further the analogy, I leave the bridge to her as she's my number 1. If I'm away or out of town, I fully expect her to hold to the mission (not break the budget, kids to school, house is clean).

Sometimes, in the heat of battle, I am confronted with conflicting data. I say "hey I want to take the kids out to dinner tonight" but she says "I have a coupon for xyz that's good for tomorrow night". Well that's a good FO, because she understands the mission.

Conversely if I treat her like she's the oldest teenager in the house, I get the feeling I'm leading from a failure standpoint, instead of leading to win.

OccamsUsername • 6 points • 25 January, 2015 09:08 PM

If you want to get a bit more abstract, both your "daddy" model and C/FO rely on male leadership, a male head of household to be "the boss".

The rest where you talk about obligations a captain has in serving his FO "because love" reads like nonsense to me. I am under no obligations at any point, but I find that acting honorably builds the healthiest type of monogamous relationship.

strategos_autokrator • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 09:35 AM

I fully agree. The captain's obligations are to the mission of getting the ship where he wants it to. From this, secondary obligations arise, which include taking care of the crew so they can contribute to his goal. This is also at the same level that the captain is responsible for the vessel, for the cargo, etc. It is ok to distribute an extra ration of rum to celebrate extraordinary commitment of the crew. You don't do it because you want to be loved by the crew, you do it to communicate that when contribute to achieve your goals, you notice. But similarly, if they don't do their work, you leave them at the Next port and hire new crew. You don't Next out of resentment, you Next because you don't have fucking time or energy to waste in getting to your goal.

This applies to *everyone* in the crew, from the surgeon-barber-cook to the First Officer. Each one contributes different stuff the ship, and they must be judged based on their realms of responsibilities. But in the end, it is all the same for everyone. Forgetting that it is about your goal is a terrible mistake. The crew senses it, and that is when they mutiny.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2015 10:08 PM

Makes sense. But just because this works for you doesn't make it the gold standard

OccamsUsername • 3 points • 25 January, 2015 10:15 PM

Rollo's article is specifically addressing betas (even as specific as Christian betas), and not strong, capable leaders. He's addressing the type of recovery cases you'll see at the MMSL forum, which is a horror show of weak, faggotized men and attention whore women.

The "gold standard" is a man who leads his family (whatever that consists of), pursues his goals, and is quick and decisive in addressing matters of disrespect. There's other personal structures that add to this (as I do with Positive Masculinity.)

A man maintains his position not by agreement, but by achievement.

strategos_autokrator • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 09:40 AM*

Essentially, Rollo realized that many people were using the Cap/FO model as way to have a covert contract. The covert contract says: "Wife let's me put this nice captain's hat because I told her she is my FO". This contract is wrong. We are always the captain no matter what. The issue Rollo attacks isn't the analogy, but when the analogy is used to cover up a contract of the men requiring approval from his wife.

I think Rollo wasn't very clear about this, and did use the Cap/FO model as a bit of straw man. I see why he did this. Athol Kay uses the Cap/FO model and also the pilot/co-pilot interchangeably. This is wrong, as the pilot/co-pilot in the way Kay explains it is a model of equality taking turns to lead.

UEMcGill • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 07:18 PM

I could easily see how a Nice Guy reverts a Captain/FO into a covert contract type relationship. Makes total sense. Too many new guys start out making the mistake of *telling* their wife "I'm man/captain, you woman/first officer" and then shitting everything up with poor decisions and poor *mission* planning. The analogy really relies leadership first.

strategos_autokrator • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 07:59 PM

I've read people's stories here were they find TRP and immediately do exactly that. It is just another victim puke. I wish there was more about the transition written.

UEMcGill • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 08:37 PM

I like that better than calling it a covert contract, because that's what it really is. Good insight.

strategos_autokrator • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 08:40 PM

TRP reveals the covert contract but the. It comes out like a victim puke of resentment.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 01:53 AM

I am sure rollo is no beta and doesn't consider how wife his FO

Perhaps I am wrong. Only he would know

OccamsUsername • 3 points • 26 January, 2015 02:02 AM

His repudiation is about male weakness, not about the C/FO model.

[deleted] • -1 points • 25 January, 2015 10:46 PM

I think you and your SO at are a bit bent out of shape because the model you use for your relationship isn't being lauded as the "right" one.

Captain/FO isn't for me. It's not for Rollo either. There plenty of other men in successful RP relationships rejecting this way of thinking too.

That's my only point

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 January, 2015 10:59 PM

Allow me to be clear, I'm not 'bent out of shape' nor do I care what you (or anyone else thinks). I have been engaging in a discussion, the same way that I engage in all discussions - not only here, but also on askTRP, RPW, and TRP. I strive to be thorough and clarify my points. Any frustration you perceive is not because you *disagree* with the C/FM dynamic - but rather because you (1) do not seem to understand the nuances and variations of this model, (2) you haven't presented any reasons or distinctions of how *your* proposed method is *fundamentally different* from the common male leader/traditional/captain dynamic that is always talked about on RP-related subs. Your denouncement also doesn't seem to be of the structure itself, but only of the beta tendencies that *can* be expressed by less capable men when they try to establish a leader/captain/traditional dynamic. Lastly (3) you haven't explained what function/value/role your wife *has* within your relationship. If she isn't useful and has no purpose, why marry her in the first place?

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 04:04 AM

If she isn't useful and has no purpose, why marry her in the first place?

Sex?

I should say I personally have sympathies for your position and for /u/OccamsUsername who is a heroic legend who created the LTR tab on TRP with a series of spectacular posts on LTR Game.

I married a lawyer with a hard edge who gladly became my eager First Officer even though I unplugged many years after the marriage (and after many years of being the "Drunk Captain." The Captain/FO is a model but it works and the ladies like it. I would not dream of making an important decision without consulting my wife.

Perhaps my Frame alone is not as strong as the combined Frame of me and my First Officer? You know, together.

strategos_autokrator • 5 points • 26 January, 2015 12:08 PM

/u/OccamsUsername series of posts should be required reading in this subreddit.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 04:13 AM

sex?

Can be acquired from many sources - and if the man in question isn't a credible leader or someone that maintains the woman attraction - then sex isn't a guarantee. A lot of married couples end up with dead bedrooms for a lot of reasons that usually boil down to the man not being masculine, and the woman not being feminine as a result. It becomes a battle and a war fought between each other, instead of a united front with the intention of tackling problems together (but in distinct ways).

Thank you for the kind words.

I believe every relationship is stronger when there are two trusted and active members contributing to the relationship, as opposed to only one.

[deleted] • -1 points • 26 January, 2015 01:51 AM

Let's be clear...if I had RP knowledge out of the gate...I would not be married.

Red pill is damage control for me. Money, access to kids...these things matter to some men.

I think you are invested in this idea of captain/first officer because it "proves" your value to the marriage.

If the laws in this land were not what they were then we wouldn't be having this silly argument. I'd have no need for a "philosophy" to guide my LTR.

I'd have the power of NEXT

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 January, 2015 02:07 AM

Let's be clear...if I had RP knowledge out of the gate...I would not be married.

Then save yourself the continuing agony of being trapped and get a divorce. If you see no value in the relationship or have any use for your wife - sever ties. It won't be fun, it'll cost you dearly, but it's a price worth paying if you honestly believe there is no benefit/purpose to your marriage.

Red pill is damage control for me.

Implementing Red Pill ideas etc can make a huge difference, but the success or failure of your goals depends entirely on your skill and ability.

I think you are invested in this idea of captain/first officer because it "proves" your value to the marriage.

As I said it's not a new idea - this dynamic and concept have been around for ages. The idea of the man being the head of the house is a traditional concept that places the man in a position of leadership. I am not married, and marriage is not a priority for me in any way shape or form (the same hold true for Occam).

I believe in the concept of having a male leader/Captain/Head of House because the relationships that implement that model are the happiest/most successful/fullfilling/and longest lasting ones. That isn't to say that there are *no* couples that have happy relationships with an egalitarian dynamic, poly relationships, or even a one-sided 'open' relationship. That said, this is supposedly a Red Pill sub and you *cannot* have a Red Pill relationship *unless* the man is the leader/Captain/Head of house. If the man is 'equal' to the woman than it is either an egalitarian or 'blue pill' relationship (doubly so with the latter if the woman has more influence and power).

My value is proven by what I do and accomplish, as well as how I interact with, talk about, and treat my SO. The relationship from the outset, was built with certain boundaries. If I break a boundary, fail to fulfill my duties, or step out of line - I *will* be single. Occam stays because I defer to, trust, admire, and have been an asset to him. He could walk out the door tomorrow and easily find another woman to bed, but he finds value in committed relationships, as do I. There's no need to verbally 'justify' my validity because I conduct myself in a way that is beneficial to Occam as well as our relationship as a whole.

Again, my issue with you (specifically) is that you don't seem to understand that what you have described (in your original post) *falls under the umbrella* of a traditional/RP/Captain and First Mate/Male head of household/traditional relationship. I've already stated several times that there are variations of this model, and different terms can be used.

If the laws in this land were not what they were then we wouldn't be having this silly

| argument.

I don't understand what you are driving at here. Are you simply stating that divorce is an economic, mental, and emotional toll?

I don't think the discussion is silly - only that your lack of clarifications, understanding, descriptions, and reasoning seem very superficial and flawed.

| I'd have the power of NEXT

You **do** have the 'power' of next - you just don't think it's worth paying the price to use it.

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 04:11 AM

Philosophical and theoretical discussions are fine but the MRP posting guidelines require women avoid giving relationship advice to men in this sub.

We also avoid giving neeext advice except in extreme cases. This sub was originally created to avoid the neeext advice in TRP and our goal is to save the marriage.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 04:20 AM

I don't think people should throw in the towel, and I was replying to the other user specifically and his claims that (1) his wife adds *nothing* to the marriage, (2) the implication that she will *never* be able to add value/assist/enhance the relationship, and (3) his claim that he flat out wishes he hadn't gotten married.

If someone honestly sees no value in the person they are tied to, and are closed off to the idea that both they and their partner can change/improve/evolve - then there's no point. He stated that he did *not* possess the power of 'next' (which isn't true).

We tell the male users on the RPW sub to seek the advice of men, and I agree with the practice, my 'advice' was more of a challenge to get him to say *something* constructive about his wife, and broaden the way he thinks about his relationship.

As you can see, I have been engaging with him regularly, and his circuitous 'reasoning' and back-tracking prompted me to try another tactic *other* than trying to explain my thoughts in an as detailed manner as possible.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 11:58 AM

Good time to step in....I never asked for advice at all.

I disputed the captain/fo model and was told to get divorced.

No where in this thread did I solicit ANY counsel.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 05:44 AM*

| Let's be clear...if I had RP knowledge out of the gate...I would not be married.

Then you should not be married. It's pretty simple. You're not a bitch. You're not controlled by someone else. If you don't want to be married, stop being married.

You can say divorce rape, blah blah, which is all valid, but pretending you have no choice is a lie.

Lets not live in the past nor in hypothetical. Take the action necessary that you think will get you closer to your goals.

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 January, 2015 11:49 AM

There is a difference between :

Don't want to be married and

Would not have married if I knew X Y Z

Now that I AM married I'd prefer to hold on to my cash and live with my kids

I am surprised you didn't make this distinction

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 January, 2015 01:58 PM

I do get that distinction. I know that money and kids is often used as an excuse to stay unhappy. It sounds to me like you've made that distinction that your choice is to be with money and kids, which is your choice given your circumstances and not an excuse for inaction. That's different than how I initially pictured the situation - my bad.

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 January, 2015 02:31 PM

Take a point. Now you get what i mean.

Also..Im not unhappy. Ive created the life that I want based on my situation when finding the pill.

Ive also never said my wife is useless she is great in bed and takes great care of the kids and my home. I just know that everything she does can be done by someone else. I now have boundaries and expectations

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 10:14 PM

You are clearly not understanding what we have been trying to clarify. *If the man is in any kind of primary leadership role within the context of a relationship then that relationship is (by default) an expression/variance of a traditional/Captain & First Mate/Leader dynamic.* Red Pill relationships fundamentally *require* that the man is looked at/treated as a leader/Captain etc. If the woman does not treat her SO/H with respect, deference, consideration etc - then he is not a leader, and the relationship is not Red Pill. The whole point of having a Red Pill relationship is so that the man can learn how to take the lead and create boundaries within which the SO/Wife/First Mate operates.

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 January, 2015 08:23 PM*

I have never once thought about this or any type of dynamic for my relationship. To me, it seems really obtuse, but I can understand the appeal of creating an analogue for this dynamic.

I live my life according to the way I want -- I am very, very selfish in that sense. I will always to give value to people who deserve it. I expect my wife to work hard to make my life better. If she's doing that, then what I want is to make her life as good as I can, because that makes me happiest. That also makes her happy, but the important thing is that it makes me happy.

I've stated explicitly that if she ever decides to stop putting in the effort to make me happy, she can expect that I will do the same. I won't put in effort for someone who does not appreciate it. My wife is pregnant. When our child comes, I know the dynamic will change -- but I will expect that she puts in the effort to make our family happy. I expect that if the family is happy, I will be happy too. If not, I'll say something and act accordingly.

So, to bring it back on topic, I don't think about dynamic. I focus on making myself happy. Often, this means

doing things that make my wife happy. My happiness has never and will never come at her expense - that's not giving value. I don't treat her as a child or teenager or first officer, whatever. I expect her to put in the effort to make me happy, and am ready to act accordingly if she fails to do so.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 09:05 PM

You have a traditional dynamic, you are the head/leader/Captain, and your SO/W either falls in line or hits the road. The terms are simply to help illustrate the kinds of things people should keep in mind *if they aren't already in a healthy/functional* dynamic. When the relationship has to be re-worked, and these ideas are foreign or odd - then having certain labels etc make it easier.

RBuddDwyer • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 11:32 PM

When the relationship has to be re-worked, and these ideas are foreign or odd - then having certain labels etc make it easier.

But they are the wrong labels. That is the problem with them. **The actual way a chain of command operates is *not* the way a successful relationship operates.** First Officers do not shit test their Captains, and Captains do not Agree and Amplify their subordinates. The penalty for mutiny and sedition is not dread game, it is death. For a chain of command to be successful, everyone in it has to have the same strategy and goal in mind. Women and men are fundamentally different, and have different goals. Women's pluralistic sexual strategy is inconsistent with men's. For one's strategy to be successful, the other must fail.

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 January, 2015 11:50 PM*

As I said, you don't *have* to use C/FM - that's just the default that the RP subs use. It's also the way traditional/male head of house/leader dynamics function. If a woman is rebelling - it's because the man isn't leading properly. You're really stuck on the terms themselves and whether or not they are *literally* being applied in the same way that the military/ships interpret them - which seems a bit asinine, but okay. It's not about a military or nautical relationship, and a wife/SO/FM won't sh-t test or buck the H/SO/Captain/Leader/Head of House etc **if** he is competent, skilled, capable, and firm.

As long as the man defines the boundaries and says "if this line is crossed, this relationship is over" there's no issue and you have your 'death' equivalent. Which is how my relationship works. I know the boundaries, and understand that *should I overstep, betray, or fail to meet the obligations expected of me* my SO will be out the door. My relationship, from the start, was built on a clearly understood dynamic.

I mentioned the difficulties because *this sub* is for men that are struggling to assert themselves. They are fighting an uphill battle. If you are trying to switch from an egalitarian to RP dynamic (with the male as head of house etc) - then that's going to be rife with difficulty. Undoing one dynamic in favor of another will cause a lot of issues, that doesn't mean it will *never* succeed in being RP - only that it will be difficult, *especially* if bad habits and issues have been allowed to take root for years on end.

RBuddDwyer • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 12:27 AM

> As I said, you don't *have* to use C/FM - that's just the default that the RP subs use.

And that is the problem. When you use terms to describe something, you necessarily bring along everything else that is associated with those terms, and the entire discussion is seen through the filter of those terms and their already existing understanding. That is the whole idea behind analogies, you are relying on someone's preexisting understanding of the analogy to describe something new. Athol Kay chose the analogy not because it was some random word he looked up

in a dictionary, but because **he actually wanted the reader to think of it as a real ship**. Read the chapter on it in MMSLP, he says it works just like it does between copilots on a plane, or between Picard and Riker on the Enterprise. **The analogy is used because that is what the people who use it really believe it is**. If that were not the case, then why not use someone other terms to describe it, like peas and carrots?

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 12:55 AM

I think both you and u/phantomdream09 are making good points.

It's sometimes hard to remember that some of the guys coming here are deeply ingrained in blue pill dynamics and having these analogies and being able to explain them can provide a guiding structure.

I don't think my advice of "being selfish" would be very practically useful for someone new because there's implicit precursory knowledge that they wouldn't have.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 12:48 AM

And that is the problem. When you use terms to describe something, you necessarily bring along everything else that is associated with those terms

Terms also adapt and change given the context/society/time within which they are used. Clearly you have a problem with "Captain" and "First Mate" which is also why I explained that I use those terms simply because it's how the Red Pill community talks about traditional/Male head of house/leader dynamics. It doesn't *have* to be only those two terms and nothing else, also there's a big difference between military/stratification of roles on a ship and how people talk about (and operate within) relationships. Focusing so minutely on the terms used - as opposed to what the terms are meant to convey/encapsulate is what non-RP subscribers do all day long as a means to mock things they disagree with. If you prefer to use "leader" and "support", "fence" and "guard dog", or "king" and "queen" that's fine - but you'll have to explain yourself over and over again in order to get other people to understand that you're talking about a C/FM or traditional/male lead relationship.

Athol Kay chose the analogy not because it was some random word he looked up in a dictionary, but because he actually wanted the reader to think of it as a real ship.

Like I said, I don't care about Athol Kay. I have no respect for his mess of a forum or his relationship. I use the terms because the community uses the terms. If he wants to tell people to think of it as an 'actual ship' then that's his thing and it sounds idiotic. Analogies do not have to be literal, and replicate exactly down to the last detail. They can speak to laymen understandings, general ideas etc.

Read the chapter on it in MMSLP, he says it works just like it does between copilots on a plane, or between Picard and Riker on the Enterprise.

I prefer not to waste my time. I understand that you are coming at this with Athol Kay in mind - but that is not how everyone comes to understand the C/FM dynamic. It's a Red Pill idea that is talked about on RPW and TRP independent of anything Athol says or said.

The analogy is used because that is what the people who use it really believe it is.

No. It's a convenient set of labels that allude to a certain way of thinking and a structure. I'll say again, I have nothing to do with, no interest in, or respect for MMSL. I've heard enough

horror stories about both Athol and the forums to make me never want to visit the site. We don't even link it on the RPW side-bar.

If that were not the case, then why not use someone other terms to describe it, like peas and carrots?

Because peas and carrots don't provide any general idea/information about the structure and ideas involved. Again, I have already said *multiple times* that I use "C/FM" because those are the terms used by the Red Pill communities - but they are nothing more than new names for very old structures and ideas.

I'm not sure why you are so focused on the terms being used, as opposed to what the terms mean within the community and what they are supposed to drive at. You linked the LTR series by Occam - so clearly you felt that was a worthwhile read. He is my SO, and I agree with everything he has written. I think that, if you put aside the terms "captain" and "first mate" as well as all the MMSL nonsense - then you'll see we're actually in agreement about how a Red Pill dynamic should function.

RBuddDwyer • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 02:41 AM

> I explained that I use those terms simply because it's how the Red Pill community talks about traditional/Male head of house/leader dynamics.

And that is the problem. The Red Pill community does not use those terms to describe marriage because the Red Pill community, for the most part, does **not** believe in marriage and therefore has no use for those terms. Athol Kay is the original source for that specific analogy, and to continue to use it continues to credit him for it. It was a bad analogy when he initially used it, and it still is to this day. When it is used in the Red Pill marriage context it is because Athol Kay put it there. **It did not exist before he first used it.**

> Because peas and carrots don't provide any general idea/information about the structure and ideas involved.

That is my point. The terms are meaningless without the rest of the context. The the rest of the context is the problem.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 03:13 AM

And that is the problem.

You keep saying that, while also changing what you mean by 'the problem.' First it was that the "Captain/First Mate" terminology wasn't a dead on/literal translation of a Captain and First Mate model on a ship, now the problem is something you have entirely made up, which I will explain/elaborate on next.

The Red Pill community does not use those terms to describe marriage because the Red Pill community, for the most part, does not believe in marriage and therefore has no use for those terms.

The Red Pill community encapsulates several different subs (TRP, askTRP, RPW, ((supposedly)) MarriedRedPill and many others). TRP is a place that focuses on male improvement, and the male sexual dating strategies (LTRs/Marriage, spinning plates/casual dating, and monk mode). There are users on TRP that are either married, or in a long-term relationship. askTRP, TRP, and RPW **all** talk about the idea of (and

use the terms) Captain/First Mate.

Now, it is *true* that TRP does not heavily encourage and endorse marriage, because there are a lot of potential consequences and drawbacks. The users there *do* mostly focus on spinning plates, but there are users that find value in relationships and are married or will get married under the right circumstances.

Athol Kay is the original source for that specific analogy, and to continue to use it continues to credit him for it.

Ideas, terms, and language continue to evolve and take on new meanings. "Blood is thicker than water" for example is often said to mean that family is more important than friends - yet the original phrasing was "the blood of the pact is thicker than the water of the womb" which means that your promise/word should be honored first, before and above family. Language is not stagnate, it changes and evolves.

It was a bad analogy when he initially used it, and it still is to this day.

I disagree (as I have explained repeatedly) and your post *describes* a dynamic that falls under the umbrella of a C&FM/Male Head of house/Traditional/leader relationship. Operating withing the Red Pill community means that you use Red Pill terms and ideas to communicate and convey certain ideas.

Again, if the C/FM idea is so devoid of value - then what is your alternative? Again, your original explanation falls within the vein of C&FM/Leader/Male Head of House/traditional dynamics. It is not a separate and alien description that has *nothing* in common with the standard C&FM (etc) idea. I have asked you several times to expand and explain how your proposed dynamic varies so dramatically that it has no relation to what is already talked about on TRP/askTRP/RPW etc.

That is my point. The terms are meaningless without the rest of the context.

The rest of the 'context' for C/FM *is entirely understandable and reasonable* to everyone else. It does not have to be literal, down to every last detail - in order to be valid. Apparently some people (as you have told me) *do* operate as though the terms are absolutely literal - so what? You're getting so tied up on a very narrow 'issue' that you're missing the larger meaning and purpose.

I have explained things as best I can, yet you don't seem to understand anything I have been driving at, but I will try one last time, because this conversation is useless if you cannot understand (or refuse to acknowledge) the overarching ideas/points I have been driving at.

1. Red Pill relationships *require* that the man is a leader. The term that RP communities use are "Captain and First Mate." These terms are not new, revolutionary, or unusual - they're just a particular expression of the more widely known traditional/male head of house/leader dynamic. A C&FM/traditional/head of house/leader dynamic can exist: if both people are aware, if only the man is aware, or if only the woman is aware, or if neither one is aware and they both simply operate naturally with a traditional frame (this often happens with more conservative/religious individuals - but it's not exclusive only to them).

2. Your original description falls under the RP "C&FM"/Head of house/leader/traditional system - please explain *specifically* how it is entirely unique, unrelated, and separate *from* any of those things.

RBuddDwyer • 3 points • 26 January, 2015 03:29 AM

I critiqued it originally in [this thread](#), and [this thread](#). I have given my critiques of the model **ad nauseum** here, and will let everyone else decide for themselves what is congruent and what is not.

As far as an alternate model. I have one in mind that I have not been able to clearly articulate yet. I get it, I understand it, but I cannot express it yet. Needless to say, anyone who has read my recent comment history knows it is based heavily on the Book of Pook.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 04:07 AM

Very briefly, I will list some of my thoughts.

Naturally masculine men will bring out femininity in women - but for men that are not naturally masculine (or are only just learning to be masculine), it will take time to learn how to 'bring out' a woman's femininity by displaying masculinity.

Masculinity and femininity are compliments of each other - and the goal (within a C/FM dynamic) is never for the woman to be able to *step into* the role of Captain permanently. A good First Mate *can* step in temporarily if the Captain is unable to. The stronger the dynamic/bond/loyalty/trust - the easier it will be to transition *back* into the original dynamic once the Captain is at full capacity again.

You go into a *literal* translation with your next bullet point, and I've already explained my issues with a verbatim interpretation. I will add that relationships do not have to be perfect in order to be successful, only that overcoming/resolving/moving past those obstacles if and when they appear is important. Teasing (which often comes to mind when people mention 'Agree and Amplify') is an effective way to diffuse, lighten, or close a topic/discussion in some cases. Some relationships are formed with the understanding of the hierarchy/roles/dynamic early on - but the users that come to this sub (and many other RP subs) are in the *process* of trying to better themselves and instill changes within the relationship

I agree that 'working towards the same goals' is important - but the C&FM work towards goals in different ways so that the same 'ground' isn't being covered twice. Having a plan, knowing what to do, and dividing responsibilities are indications of a competent leader that knows how to diversify and utilize the talents of his SO/W. Men and women can have different goals - but that doesn't mean those goals are incompatible or destructive to each other. Both people in a relationship *must* be concerned with the health/stability of the relationship, and it's *very unusual* for the two to have *zero* common goals. People pair off and marry because they have things in

common (travel a lot, or settle down with a house and raise a family just as two basic examples).

I've said before that I have limited familiarity with, and absolutely interest *in* Athol Kay, MMSL etc.

ship should be one where the husband is a man and is masculine. The wife is then driven to be more feminine, and the natural submissiveness that comes with true femininity drives her to want to follow his lead. It's not that the wife takes command from the captain when he is unfit for command, its that the wife is no longer driven to be feminine, and therefore loses her desire to submit to him and follow him.

A competent First Mate *can and will* temporarily step in when the Captain is unable to (at least if she's worth her salt).

In regards to your other comment:

Just be a man, enjoy life, pursue your passions and be the best you can be at what you love. That is the masculinity that stimulates the feminine. The feminine sees this and wants to be a part of it. There is no need for a command and control structure. There is no need for a construct that ultimately sets the wrong frame. There is no need for any of it.

I agree with this, and again - when the man is taking the lead, that is inherently traditional/male head of house/ Captain and First Mate/leader etc. The 'Captain and First Mate' terms are simply the labels that the Red Pill communities use.

I don't understand your issues with the idea of a woman being useful and contributing in a positive and constructive way *as a result* of being inspired to respect, look up and defer to, as well as listen to her SO/H.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 05:58 AM

As far as an alternate model. I have one in mind that I have not been able to clearly articulate yet. I get it, I understand it, but I cannot express it yet.

Then it's useless at this point (and that may change once you figure out how to explain it). If you cannot articulate an idea, then it cannot be used as an explanation, or as an influence around which to base meaningful advice. It exists not only in theory, but in a theory so abstract that you haven't figured out how to communicate those ideas/thoughts to others in a way that they can make sense of/interpret.

I hope you find a way to articulate your idea, because I'm interested to know more about it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 01:59 AM

Use king and queen then...if the king dies...the new husband of the queen ain't the fucking king

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 02:11 AM

What is your point here? This doesn't make sense. If a man marries a queen - he *inherits* the crown and title of 'king' - but again, the terms are not meant to be literal, only illustrative.

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 January, 2015 01:58 AM

You keep saying that c/fm is the default..it's not.

It's your strategy.....

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 02:19 AM*

It's the 'default' because *that is what the Red Pill community talks about*. Red Pill relationships *do not* operate on an egalitarian platform. Red Pill relationships *only* talk about the *man* taking the lead (being a leader/Captain/Head of House etc). I honestly do not know how else to try and explain this. "Captain and First Mate" just happen to be the terms that the Red Pill communities use.

Again, the description you use in your initial post *falls under the captain/FM umbrella* and you have repeatedly failed to explain how it is *entirely different from and alien to* the Captain/First Mate dynamic. If you are in charge - then that's great, except successful relationships require two productive members. Sometimes only the man is aware and the woman follows naturally, other times the woman is aware and simply chooses to defer to the SO/H, and in some cases neither person is really aware - they just form a traditional relationship.

If your wife has no value, and you see her as entirely useless, then the most sensible recourse is to get a divorce. If you aren't even *open* to the possibility that *both you and your wife* are capable of improving, changing, and developing new roles (granted that you will be responsible for creating a new dynamic and nurturing positive responses from her), then your venture with Red Pill will not be as meaningful as it could otherwise be. Anyone is capable of change and improvement if they are properly inspired and motivated. Make her love and admire you and she will naturally want to start behaving in new, different, and better ways.

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 January, 2015 01:57 AM

Great point about shit testing captains.

Women strive to break a man. They will leave you when you no longer serve their interests. It's our job to keep them inline. Asking them to serve as FO isn't consistent with this goal

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 January, 2015 03:19 AM

1. You do not 'ask' them to serve - either they earn their keep by contributing (after you have established yourself as the leader etc) or they relinquish the claim/right/privilege to your commitment/consideration/affection/fidelity.
2. Women strive to find capable men. They test men, and those that are weak and incapable are bogged down. When a man is assertive, and a good leader - a woman no longer bucks his authority because he is meeting her needs and providing a healthy frame within which she can operate.
3. If a wife/SO is willing to abandon you so easily, then that indicates that you lack the skills, abilities, and knowledge required to inspire her trust, admiration, respect, deference, and

focus.

jacktenofhearts • 3 points • 25 January, 2015 08:59 PM*

I've referenced Captain/FO in almost every one of my comments. Personally, I think it's a great analogy. Here's why:

Women don't want to be TOLD that they're "being included"

The Captain/FO relationship should always be implicit. You should be and act like the unquestioned leader of your household. This is identical to pretty much every other Red Pill technique I've seen. You don't announce you're increasing your value, you just do it. You don't announce you're considering Dread Game, you just do it. Sometimes I read critiques about the Captain/FO dynamic where the husband is literally telling his wife, "you're my FO." This is ridiculous to me. Does anyone actually think this is how you establish a Captain/FO dynamic?

The Captain First Mate dynamic allows for "mutual frame". This is not a place for a LEADER as you have written about.

I'm offered a job transfer across the country that pays 20% more salary. I'm tempted to take it. When I talk to my wife, she raises some valid issues. Despite the pay increase, the transfer is still technically a lateral move in my company, the cost of living will be higher, the school districts aren't as good, etc. If I say, "good points, I will decline the transfer offer," did I succumb to "mutual frame"?

Assigning your SO the role of First Mate implies that YOU are assuring her that her voice will be heard, her input will be considered, because you love her so much.

I don't consider my wife my FO because I feel the need to assure her of anything. I consider my wife my FO because **she is a good FO.**

Let's say I disregard her advice and insist on moving my family. We pay too much in rent, offsetting any increased pay. Our kids become friends with some delinquents at their new school and their grades tank. The housing market crashes in our old city, so we can't even sell our old house because we're technically underwater on the mortgage.

My wife would not shriek like a harpy about how she was right and I ruined everything and seek to emasculate me. That means she's a shitty FO and I wouldn't tolerate that. Instead, what I think would happen is I would focus on my job and getting a new one at an even higher salary than the 20% increase that I just received. She would do things like fly back to our old home and find renters until the housing market rebounds. Together, we'd figure out what other school options there are for our kids.

This is a joke to women who already know they have the blameless option of abandoning or jumping the ship.

If my wife immediately divorced me in the above scenario, this would hardly be "blameless." The American court system does not care about blame, so yes, I'd be fucked for alimony and child support. But this is true under any circumstance once the marriage license is signed.

If I made a series of these decisions -- where I consulted my wife, and then overruled her despite some decent logical arguments, and led my family into an objectively worse situation -- then yes, on a long enough timeline, she would probably say "she's not happy" and divorce my ass and live pretty well on alimony and child support from me. You could see this as the FO "jumping ship" and the Captain "going down with the ship." I prefer to see it as, a Captain can only be shitty for so long before his crew abandons him.

Women will respond much better to a firm, sometimes nice, sometimes asshole father figure than a self

promoted captain looking for her input when she shares ZERO consequences for failure

And if you made a series of bad decisions as "father figure," how would your outcome be different than mine? I'm really trying to see why you think this analogy is materially different. The only thing I can think of is that you think a Captain **must always** consult is FO. This is categorically false. For moving my entire family across the country, I would consult my wife. But I make many decisions without consulting her at all, because I feel confident it's a good decision and I know my wife would defer to my judgement. The Captain can consult his FO any time he wants. If he has a good FO, he will want to do this more often than if he has a bad FO. But he is never required to, and if he's a good Captain this won't be questioned.

RBuddDwyer • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 07:27 PM*

/u/BluePillProfessor and I have been debating this already for the better part of a month now. I first dissented on the C/FO metaphor in this thread.

Definitely check out this article from No Ma'am: Woman: the most responsible teenager in the house

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 09:56 PM

Thanks. I'll check this out

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 08:39 PM*

the Captain/First Mate arrangement ISNT a CORE template for RP relationships

This is absolutely true. Rollo Tomossi rejects the Captain/FO dynamic so it could not possibly be a "core tenant" of Red Pill Marriage or /r/marriedredpill. If you have a better way we are all ears. Some of this is written in stone but the Captain/FO is not one of those.

However, MOST guys today find the Captain/FO dynamic is a huge improvement over our pre-Red Pill relationship. It is also more palatable and better to introduce to "strong" women filled with feminism. Even most of them prefer to be the First Officer.

The claim in your post that women don't want input is wrong- women absolutely want input into the decisions. They just don't want to make that decision (so they can't be blamed). Most women prefer a Captain/FO arrangement and sorry to break it to you- women are a part of marriage.

Let me be even bolder- Rollo is wrong. There are TWO frames in marriage. Hopefully yours is the dominate one but completely subsuming her frame into yours just seems creepy.

Most of us started way in the hole and suddenly becoming Father Knows Best will be seen as disrespecting your long suffering harpy, sex denying wife. So if you want to offer this model you need to tell us how to get from Beta Putz or "Drunk Captain" to a single all controlling Frame.

Also, even Father Knows Best consults the children about their preferences, needs, and desires and takes them into account. He even talks to them about what they are going to do! He is a father not a dictator.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 10:06 PM

Definitively some good points here about beta putzes not going from being walked all over to a completely dominant frame.

The capt/fo framework is certainly an improvement over that mess.

I'll think more about your comments that rollo is wrong. I don't think my marriage would be where it is now if I enlisted a FO.

My gut tells me capt/so is a stopover point more than a destination

strategos_autokrator • 2 points • 26 January, 2015 12:19 PM

My gut tells me capt/so is a stopover point more than a destination

Follow your gut. It is what captains do. You hire people base on their skills, and where you can trust them. Not everyone can be a good officer. Not all women are fit to be FO. Accept that, and they find what other jobs they are good at in a way you can rely on them. If they thrive there, better for everyone in the ship. After all, in a way, the barber-surgeon-cook is more critical for the well-being of the crew than the FO is.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 09:01 PM

I'll just copy my reply to you here as well.

Let me start by saying that first...your LTR or girlfriend, doesn't want to be your "First Mate".

/u/OccamsUsername is my SO (Captain) and I am the girlfriend. I *do* want to be the First Mate.

It may be helpful for other men to see that the Captain/First Mate arrangement ISNT a CORE template for RP relationships despite the fact that YOU think it is so.

Yeah, try telling the RPW sub that the Captain/First Mate arrangement isn't useful, applicable, and a core idea of RP relationships. Women can *be* First Mates, even if the Captain isn't trying to be one, just as a man can *be* a Captain/leader even if his SO/W has no idea. We are talking about new terms for very old and traditional ideas - with the man being the head of the household, and the woman being the support.

A strong male role (or CAPTAIN) is essential for the relationship to work.

I agree.

Assigning your SO the role of First Mate implies that YOU are assuring her that her voice will be heard, her input will be considered, because you love her so much.

Only when I have something insightful/relevant to say, only when my suggestions are constructive/useful, and his loving me doesn't mean I get to make outlandish suggestions that are nonsensical or destructive to our relationship. A First Mate has to be *useful*, proactive, logical, and respectful. If she cannot conduct herself in an appropriate manner, then she isn't a First Mate.

You think you will be appreciated for "listening to her thoughts" and "including her"... You will not. This is left over Bluepill fantasy.

My SO *does* appreciate when I help come up with solutions, point out flaws in proposed plans of action, or simply resolve issues on my own. He can trust me to be a supportive agent that works not only for his benefit, but also for the betterment of our relationship.

The problem with Tomassi's article is that it *assumes* "If there is a Captain, then the First Mate will be granted consideration and status simply because *he loves her*." That's not how the dynamic works. The Captain has to establish himself, and create boundaries. As the woman proves herself more controlled and useful - *then* her input is more carefully considered. Being a First Mate is a status that has to be earned through both words *and* (most importantly) actions. You don't listen to a woman that has openly berated you in front of friends or family - because she has already *shown* that she's incapable of stepping back and making the protection of your reputation (and that of the relationship as a whole) a priority *over* her own selfish/petty need to 'win.' A strong relationship isn't about one individual winning, it's about both people working together and as a united front (but in different, structured ways). There are things that my SO takes care of, just as there are things I take care of,

and we have built a dynamic that allows us to tackle issues in a double pronged formation, with different priorities in mind. An example would be a cowboy that ropes a bull while another person brands the rump. Both work towards the same goal, but have different duties.

The Captain First Mate dynamic allows for "mutual frame". This is not a place for a LEADER as you have written about.

There is no 'mutual frame.' The terms were set, if I want to be with Occam, there are conditions. I give deference to Occam at any and every level that he deems necessary for the health of our relationship. I am not his slave, this is not a kink, and there's no written contract. I am not devoid of self-confidence, nor do I doubt my abilities. I am an asset to him, a resource that can be directed and trusted to accomplish a myriad of tasks. If I were to suddenly go off the deep end and fight him for no reason at every step - then not only would he stop listening to me, he'd also be out the door.

Women will respond much better to a firm, sometimes nice, sometimes asshole father figure than a self promoted captain looking for her input when she shares ZERO consequences for failure

You don't 'self-promote' yourself to Captain in name - you assert yourself with actions and conduct. You create a structure that brings order to the relationship. The First Mate should *always* be held accountable for her own contributions and conduct. Her influence is directly proportional to the validity of her input and the consistency of her actions.

RBuddDwyer • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 10:02 PM

It's the man's life that she is attracted to and invited to follow in. There is no need to overcomplicate it anymore that that.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 10:37 PM

Exactly. For me to call my wife first mate because she decides what the kids eat for lunch is hamstering the fact that she isn't my equal. And she can easily be replaced if she isn't being a good wife

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 10:44 PM*

The First Mate is never *equal* to the Captain. They are inherently different roles, with different objectives, functions, and priorities. You don't celebrate the fact that your wife feeds the kids lunch. (Ideally) You acknowledge that she is the caretaker and ward of your children. That she sets a good example, and looks after their physical, emotional, and (if applicable) spiritual needs - just as she does those things for you.

RBuddDwyer • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 11:25 PM*

The First Mate is never *equal* to the Captain.

Yes, he can be depending on the circumstances. Reread MMSLP. Athol Kay himself uses the "copilot" analogy to describe the dynamic, **and explicitly says the two are equal.**

They are inherently different roles, with different objectives, functions, and priorities.

No, they are not. The FO can (and does) step up and take control when the Captain is unavailable.

This does not happen in a successful marriage. The husband is head of the family always. The wife submits to his authority always. The wife rebels against his authority (shit tests, etc...) and he reinforces his position as the authority. This is **not** what happens on a real ship. This is **not** the way a real chain of command operates.

You can define and describe your relationship however you want. Call it C/FO even. Just understand that your relationship model, whatever you want to label it, is **not** that of a real Captain / First Officer. The way a sexual relationship works is **no way** to run a chain of command.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2015 11:47 PM

Yes, he can be depending on the circumstances. Reread MMSLP.

I don't read MMSLP, Athol leaves the house when his wife is on her period to stay out of her way and he sounds like an idiot. I use the terminology of "Captain" and "First Mate" because that is what is commonly used on RP related subs. That said, it's really just a new label on a product that has been around forever (ie the traditional relationship structure with the man as leader/head of household and the wife as a support personnel).

No, they are not. The FO can (and does) step up and take control when the Captain is unavailable.

Yes they are. The man has functions and duties, he delegates tasks and has control over certain spheres of the relationship. The wife can, should, and *does* step in *temporarily* when the man is otherwise incapable of taking the lead. It's a temporary condition, not a permanent one (if it's permanent, then it's not a Red Pill/Captain and First Mate/male leader/head of house relationship). A good wife is proactive and she works to improve, maintain, protect the integrity of the relationship (as well as the reputation of her SO/H). Being respectful, responsible, dependable, proactive, and selfless are all important characteristics of a good wife/SO/First mate.

The FO can (and does) step up and take control when the Captain is unavailable. This does not happen in a successful marriage.

I disagree. A strong marriage/relationship has a solid foundation that holds strong *even when problems manifest*. A successful marriage does not mean "bad things never happen, and there are *never* problems" - because problems/obstacles can manifest outside of a relationship as well as within in it and affect the couple (examples: death/illness of a friend/relative, financial problems, burglary, car accident/legal problems, stress of a job/school, problems that children are experiencing etc). Successful relationships are the ones that know how to approach, tackle, and resolve issues when they appear. If something horrible happens, you don't fall apart as a couple, but band together and figure out what to do.

The husband is head of the family always. The wife submits to his authority always.

I agree, and I never stated otherwise. A competent leader/Captain/Head of House *also* knows/recognizes when his SO/Wife/FM provides valuable input and makes valid suggestions. He knows how to utilize her abilities and strengths. He doesn't do *all* the work while the woman sits on her hands and does nothing. A successful dynamic requires two active participants.

The wife rebels against his authority (shit tests, etc...) and he reinforces his position as the authority. This is not what happens on a real ship. This is not the way a real chain of command operates.

This doesn't make sense to me, can you clarify what you mean or state it another way? If a woman rebels to a point that the man finds unacceptable - then he leaves. The point of being a good leader however, is that he knows how to reign in and quell bad tendencies if and when they manifest. As for how 'real chain of command' works - you'll have to explain a bit more. The

Captain/First Mate terms are an analogy - and not meant to be used as a literal interpretation of actual military/nautical structures. I agree that with a competent and effective leader - the woman will be *less likely* to rebel and buck his authority - but (again) that depends on the skill of the leader, and his ability to establish boundaries etc.

Similarly, there are women that seek to be a good/supportive/FM/SO/Wife, and they embrace the mentalities, ideas, and philosophies that are talked about on the RPW sub, even when (and if) the SO/H in question is not dominate, Red Pill, or naturally masculine. They pursue working on themselves and bettering their personalities/skills/attitudes because they want to do their part, and improve the relationship. There's nothing wrong with that. As I said the Captain/First Mate dynamic can exist *even if* only the man thinks of himself as the Captain/leader/head of house and the wife/SO has no formal knowledge about it (as long as she instinctively/gradually/naturally falls in line, just as it can exist *even if* only the woman is trying to become a good FM/W/SO etc.

NotABibleScholar • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 09:27 PM

Ultimately it is like with most RP terms you'll have slight variance of opinion. You could easily look at the most responsible teenager in the house the same as a FO. If you have a Sahm... Who watches the kids when you are work? Who cleans or ensures cleaning is being done, etc.. Its all about delegation, my wife has the authority I delegate to her. She regularly asks for input, or tells me of decisions and asks for critiques. When I am home she defers to me most of the time unless I'm busy and she needs to make a call. She offers input on decisions I make, usually respectfully but not always and she is often brutally honest. Either term doesn't change much for me, my wife is my equal in a loose sense but not that we are the same. There is hierarchy, or pecking order at play. Edit: replied to the wrong post. Edit: let me clarify by equal... She speaks with my voice.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 09:31 PM

I agree with everything you said.

strategos_autokrator • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 12:14 PM

If the captain is very sick with dysentery, the FO runs the day-to-day of the ship, consulting the captain for crucial decisions until the captain recovers. This isn't a take over of power, but the FO doing the duty the post requires.

This doesn't mean FO is in charge over the captain ever, or that now that the captain is sick he submits to the FO. It just means the FO accepts and understands the captain's vision well enough to make sure things don't fall apart while the captain recovers.

strategos_autokrator • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 09:44 AM

I'm a big fan of maritime memoirs from a 19th century bad ass. He was captain of a merchant ship that ended up cast away. His crew abandoned him in the process, every man for himself, and he was stuck with what he considered savages, protecting his wife and two kids.

You know what he did? He built tools and with the tools he build a boat from palm trees. A huge boat with several masts, big enough for his whole family to live comfortably for weeks. His wife and kids helped building it, but also, making stuff they could exchange to the locals to pay for their assistance and materials. Her wife was in charge of that part of the operation. Meanwhile he trained the locals to make nails for his boat, and bought them off them with stuff his wife and kids produced. The whole time he talks about the strength and

resourcefulness of his wife and children. They were also badasses. When the boat was finished, they sailed it all the way back home.

Years later the same man built another boat, this time, by himself, and took off, by himself, and became the first man to travel around the world alone. When he came back years later, he was a world hero. And his wife divorced him.

Was his wife a great FO? Absolutely. Was he THE Captain? Yeah. Did he need the FO to get where he wanted? No. In fact, in the mission that made him make history, he *had* to go without an FO.

For me, this is what the Captain/FO relationship means. No covert contracts, just using the best resources you have to get the solutions you need.

leftajar • 1 point • 26 January, 2015 06:38 PM

I think you're misunderstanding what Captain/First Mate means.

The First Mate has to submit to the Captain. Always, 100% of the time.

This analogy also reflects the truth, that she will occasionally have useful input, and she is responsible for executing some of your orders.

Try another analogy: Lieutenant/Sergeant. The Lieutenant devises the orders, and the Sergeant bosses around the privates (the children.) Similar idea.

My point is, I think we're arguing over a distinction that doesn't exist.

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 27 January, 2015 04:31 PM

The First Mate has to submit to the Captain. Always, 100% of the time.

This is not true. Sometimes the Captain is the Drunk Captain and is not fulfilling his duties. Rarely a FO even relieves the Captain of duty when he is mentally unfit. If the ship is headed for the rocks and the Captain is dead drunk in his cabin, there is little else the FO can do except seize the wheel and turn it sharply.

This is one of the reasons some of us oppose the 'all encompassing frame' model proposed by Master Rollo and why the Father Knows Best model also fails. It may work pretty well when the Captain is being the Captain but what about when he is not. If your FO is nothing but an obedient child the ship is going aground when the Captain checks out.

leftajar • 1 point • 27 January, 2015 05:01 PM

True, I wasn't allowing for the possibility of the Captain dropping the ball.

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 January, 2015 11:39 PM

If I ask my kid if he is hungry and he said he already ate lunch then he provided valuable information. I listened to him

Does he get a title? First steward?

NotABibleScholar • 2 points • 27 January, 2015 02:03 AM

No, but a wife is different... Would you put one of your children in charge of your wife? One might put a younger more responsible child over an older child.. But a wife is distinct...