

Briffaults law vs. you are the captian of the relationship

February 19, 2019 | 7 upvotes | by [MartinVDK91](#)

I stumbled across briffaults law, which states that every condition of the association with a male in a relationship is determined by her.

We say, we should be the captain in the relationship, she is the first boatsman. I see a slight dis conception here.

As far as I interpret it and bring both together is, she at any point can say (as you can) I am getting off that boat when she doesn't see any remedy anymore to associate with you (including all the subcontext of BL like past invested equity from your side, doesn't mean shit today etc.), but you basically steer it, give it direction. So in other words, she determines the starting point and you determine where and how the ship is going. Am I right in this corse assumption? I hope maybe some seasoned sailors can chime in here, as I (as one can see from my last posts) have stumbled upon some roadblocks hahaha.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

mrpthrowa • 27 points • 19 February, 2019 02:36 PM

You steer the boat (or not) however you see fit. She chooses whether to get on it. She may jump to a faster boat. All around though, it's not too difficult to steer a boat such that she will want to stick around. Most boat dwellers are much more likely to stay around then to risk jumping off and drowning. You'd have to be pretty drunk to let your boat get so off course as to make jumping off a better scenario.

qwertyuiop111222 • 11 points • 19 February, 2019 04:10 PM

This man boats.

SeamusAwl • 10 points • 19 February, 2019 02:44 PM

I think you are missing the mark here. You are the captain of the ship, your destination is determined whether she is on board or not. She doesn't even determine the starting point. Only thing she determines is if and when she will get on board.

Redpillbrigade17 • 6 points • 19 February, 2019 03:06 PM*

First of all, although it's a "law" it's neither a law or rule in the legal sense, nor a law in the natural world sense (eg no law of gravity). So take it with some salt and always see how true it is in your own observation of the world, and if there may be any exceptions.

Now the way I read it, it simply says that short of rape, it is the woman who lets the man impregnate her. She chooses the AF/ BB based on her hypergamous nature, as we know. So it's just another way to say ovules are precious, sperm is cheap. Hence the bargaining power is massively favoring the women. Especially true in modern age, post waves of feminism, emancipation, contraceptives and enlightenment.

That reality is indeed in conflict with the captain of the boat view. But our boat metaphor is a very helpful, constructive and rational way to look at your life as so compelling that a woman will choose you. And you will be undeterred when she no longer wants to stay in the boat, or rock it too much with her drama, crappy behaviors etc.

To summarize, Briffault law is a general description of human nature, whereas the captain/FO dynamic is a mental and social interaction model.

Good luck.

itiswr1tten • 5 points • 19 February, 2019 04:50 PM

Briffault's is meant to teach "don't think anything you've done in the past counts". Lots of guys fall in the trap of thinking "being a good man/husband/bf" means anything. All she cares about is the present moment, or what have you done for me lately.

Captain mindset is about leading and doing so consistently, so as to make the aforementioned desire for association perpetual. A man who is leading and doing his thing sends a clear signal that being on the ship has great benefits, but the position is earned not given.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 February, 2019 02:46 PM

All she cares about is the present moment, or what have you done for me lately.

This also works in the drunk captain's favor when he starts fixing his shit. If she is feeling good regardless of the past she's going to desire a man even if he was nearly capsizing the boat prior.

Westernhagen • 3 points • 19 February, 2019 03:34 PM

The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family.

No. You have choices, too. If she decides to cheat on you, or get fat, or deny you sex, or whatever else is sufficient to cause you to leave, then she has not determined all the conditions of the family because you exercised a veto.

Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no such association takes place."

And if you (the male) are deriving no benefit from your association from the female, you should also end the association. If your only "benefit" is negative - avoidance of divorce rape - that is no excuse.

Kpwn88 • 2 points • 19 February, 2019 05:35 PM

whatever else is sufficient to cause you to leave, then she has not determined all the conditions of the family because you exercised a veto

Look at it this way. The animal kingdom started off all female, reproducing asexually. Males evolved later out of a need for intrasexual competition to weed out weaker genes. Only about 40% of human males ever sire children for instance.

So basically, even though males are there to serve the female, men evolved to a point that women are so dependent on us, we serve them by *leading* them. It's a mindfuck, but it makes sense. If you can't lead her, she won't need you. Women evolved to be completely dependent on their male counterparts more than any other species on the planet.

Westernhagen • 1 point • 19 February, 2019 05:56 PM

I am mainly pushing back against the "face value" interpretation of the "law". If she "determined **all** the conditions", then she would have all the options; you would have none; she would have no obligation to provide value to you; you would have an unlimited obligation to provide value to her. None of this is true, and it encourages either MGTOW (total rejection of the female) or bluepill (total subjection to the female). You have choices. If she is not providing value to you, you should leave. *You* will determine *some* of the conditions of the family - and in the extreme case, if you are deriving no benefit from the female, you will end the association.

women are so dependent on us, we serve them by leading them.

As you may know if you read Dalrock, the bluepill Christian types have reversed this to "we lead women by serving them". Hilarious, and sad.

Kpwn88 • 3 points • 19 February, 2019 07:11 PM

lead women by serving them

Topping from the bottom. lol

helaughsinhidden • 3 points • 19 February, 2019 03:54 PM

Update to LTR break-up story and learn from my mistakes of failing too many comfort tests and being too alpha

Apparently you must have been rowing your boat too fast and she fell off.

MartinVDK91 • 1 point • 19 February, 2019 04:14 PM

Yes, that is exactly what happend.

helaughsinhidden • 1 point • 19 February, 2019 04:44 PM

Rambo is not alpha.

Going Rambo is an emotional overreaction to your butthurt feelz.

You aren't rowing too fast.

You might only be just starting to move the boat actually. Instead, what you are doing is throwing a huge temper tantrum that is **rocking** the boat, which is in rough water, because you were a drunk captain without direction, leadership, vision, or a real mission.

This isn't BL to blame.

You have established patterns of weak behavior and then traded that for instability and anger. You are to blame for her jumping off the ship.

MartinVDK91 • 1 point • 19 February, 2019 04:54 PM

I don't quiet understand. What weak behaviours are you speaking about? And where and why should I have been butthurt? There was no reason. And where is that huge temper tantrum?

What does BL stand for?

helaughsinhidden • 2 points • 19 February, 2019 06:23 PM

BL = Briffaults Law

Your other posts and comments tell the story of a man:

What weak behaviours are you speaking about?

You swing from trying to be Mr. Comfort during different parts of her cycle and being accused of acting "too macho" in others. You are in her frame

Clearly you care way too much about what she thinks and feels. You are in her frame.

You have oneitis over your LTR, even though we can hardly call a Christmas to Valentines relation "long term". She used you for the holidays bru.

You have analyzed the length, frequency, and order of text messages and phone calls to her. You have a hamster brain.

Claim to have been lifting for "8 years" but have stats worse than mine were after just 4 months.

Liar, weakling, or just fucking around.

Claim dread level 8, daily game, daily sex, zero rejections..... but she dumped you?! Doesn't add up.

You thought calling her daily will make you lose frame. You haven't a clue what frame is or how to maintain it.

You claimed once to be spinning 6-7 plates, but all your posts indicate someone who lacks an abundance mentality. In fact, she dumped you via and then you were trying to chase her.

And where and why should I have been butthurt?

Again, your comments about "going too rambo". That term is normally used to describe a man who has just woken up to the truth he's a beta and it's his own fault that he's been in a shitty marriage FOR A LONG TIME. His anger is like a captain in his ship rocking the boat. It shows he is has felt some pain and just can't handle it like a man. Being easily emotional and having strong reactions in the moment are specifically feminine qualities, not masculine. The action does no good for a man's mission and causes people who are "on his crew" to lose more trust, confidence, and want to GTFO the boat. I will give you the benefit of doubt, in your case, maybe this is just you feeling the rejection of being dumped and just got confused over the nomenclature or are trying to save face to the rest of the subreddit..... that's anonymous.

Look, I wish you the best, but I think your role playing TRP and your girl knows it's coming off as phony.

MartinVDK91 • 1 point • 19 February, 2019 07:16 PM*

Thanks first for your reply.

To the first point: I don't try to be a schizophrenic, rather try to slip some beta in during her fitting cycle as Rollo suggested and keeping my guards up now for comfort tests

2. I didn't think about it before, saying, I wasn't aware of her emotional state as Dave Franco suggests. I started thinking now about it, analysing the situation and learning from it.

Hyperfocus definitely got my brain started in that regard since it happend, so I learn quick and a lot from this shit.

3. True. She's a HSE good girl, haven't had any last year, just idiots. Never had the problem to come up with something to say. I have to expand my options, but due to some shit happening at uni I had to take time away from gaming new girls, right. It was different last year, but probably, why I also didn't reach my goals with he second engineering degree yet, I am pursuing.

1. I have not "analyzed" them. I take corse measurements in length and reply time to never come across as needy or overly attached

5. I probably was in the limbic part of my brain, when I wrote it and wasn't exact enough.

Take it as an excuse or not. I started 8 years ago with major pauses inbetween. Going regulary since 01/18

6. She dumped me, because she hadn't gotten her emotional needs met.

1. Probably, I don't know. I thought I make the shots as a captain. But I'd like to hear what would have been a better strategy there, than telling her, let me think about it and after a while I agreed to it. What was wrong about that?

2. That was last year. As I said, due to high stress levels at uni I have 3 now, but I'd not consider any of them LTR material

I wasn't sure about the term rambo. For me, handling her comfort test as shit test, the term ramboed them sounded fitting to that. I haven't looked up the contextual meaning in the red pill. Yeah.

I hope and think, all of this cleared a lot up. As I said, under stress, my brain goes into survival mode. Miss minute things than.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 February, 2019 03:51 AM

DEER.

MartinVDK91 • 1 point • 20 February, 2019 05:57 PM*

Well I explained it to you guys? Of course I won't "DEER" when I am with a women/girl.

SeamusAwl • 1 point • 19 February, 2019 05:07 PM

Briffault's law

RedForEducation • 3 points • 19 February, 2019 07:48 PM

The point is to make a man focus on things under his control.

If a woman wants a relationship to work, I guarantee it will work. If a guy really wants it to he gets co dependant and validation seeking towards it, which causes chicks to leave often times.

So you build a man, and she builds and fosters the relationship, it's the most stable scenario I've seen, from plates to marriage.

mrp_awakening • 2 points • 19 February, 2019 02:58 PM

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

The interpretation is simple... unconditional love doesn't exist in females for their mates. They love what you currently are, and what you bring to the table. But the second you're no benefit anymore, she'll bail.

You see this in a few examples... in the AF Carousel days, a woman might pursue only short term mating strategies. Those guys are good fucks, but bad relationship material. Once they've gotten the fucks in, it's on to the next one.

In a BB only scenario, the second the man quits being a good provider, she's gonna bail. Or if she can derive greater benefit elsewhere (hypergamy), she might do so.

SeamusAwl • 3 points • 19 February, 2019 05:08 PM

The interpretation is simple... unconditional love doesn't exist in females for their mates. They love what you currently are, and what you bring to the table. But the second you're no benefit anymore, she'll bail.

Ms Jackson explains Briffault's Law perfectly - "What have you done for me lately?"

simbarlion • 2 points • 19 February, 2019 10:16 PM

It kinda depends on how much she likes your seamen.

And also how good you are with your "oar".

MartinVDK91 • 1 point • 20 February, 2019 12:44 AM

She worships my seamen as I furrow my oar skillfully through her soft waters.

red-sfpplus • 4 points • 19 February, 2019 03:26 PM

Give less fucks about theory. Lots of RP is written by men who have 13" biceps yet preach to go and lift.

In my case I define the start the middle and the end of every single relationship I have in my life.

But I am not you and you are sure as fuck not me.

..... MartinVDK91 • 1 point • 19 February, 2019 04:09 PM

Right, the same I do. I am you in regards to motorcycle racing and your AD brain probably (just recently found out the later one).

ianellwood21 • 1 point • 19 February, 2019 06:35 PM

You are the captain 100%. She's a sailor for hire. It's up to you to make her want to stay on your boat. The only decisions she makes are in reaction to whether or not you are a good captain. There's two scenarios:

- A) You are a great captain, she trusts you to lead her and she stays by your side
- B) She doesn't feel safe with your ability to lead and she jumps ship

Briffault's law states she has the power to leave, but you have the power to determine whether or not she does.