

# **There goes the neighborhood: A look at the RP mentality of “enjoy the decline”.**

March 17, 2019 | 7 upvotes | by [stevierose789](#)

---

The best way I can explain my position against thinking this way, which to me is basically a defeatist attitude, is to use it in a real scenario in my life.

My immediate neighborhood is in decline. A few neighbors on my street have let their houses go to shit. Up the street from me the houses have been well kept. My house is actually the buffer house between the decline and the maintained homes. So what do I do? Do I enjoy the decline and let my house go to shit or do I take pride in the fact that I have a beautiful well maintained home? So who does it benefit if I decide to keep maintaining a beautiful home? It is not only my family, but my neighborhood as well.

You can easily replace the scenario of the neighborhood with that of America. What joy can anyone find in its demise?

---

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

---

## Comments

---

reluctantly\_red • 16 points • 17 March, 2019 11:29 AM

*Enjoy the decline* is just a way of saying that the rules have changed and guys need to adapt. Being a good little workhorse is no longer a viable option. This applies in both economic and sexual arenas. In the post WWII era the fruits of increases in productivity were shared pretty much equally between business and labor. Today workers get nearly no part of increases in productivity. The economic world is becoming increasingly unequal. Likewise the sexual marketplace is also becoming increasingly unequal for guys. Being a good dutiful husband doesn't mean shit anymore. He's just as disposable as the good dutiful factory worker.

No one is actually enjoying the decline. They're just trying to find ways to mitigate the personal costs.

Willow-girl • 4 points • 17 March, 2019 11:37 AM

Being a good dutiful husband doesn't mean shit anymore. He's just as disposable as the good dutiful factory worker.

In all fairness, there was a time when a woman was assured that if she stuck around and was faithful, her husband couldn't just divorce her and leave her destitute if he developed a hankering for younger/hotter/tighter. As long as she upheld her end of the bargain, she could count on having a provider-for-life.

Those days are long gone, too.

reluctantly\_red • 7 points • 17 March, 2019 11:48 AM

The world has indeed become less secure and more unequal for all. However, its men who both benefit the most and suffer the most as a result. Men are over-represented at both ends of the economic hierarchy -- and at both ends of the sexual hierarchy. Life has never been better for super rich men or super good looking men. However, life on the bottom of the totem pole is increasingly grim.

These realities fall hardest upon men at the bottom. More men are both homeless and sexless.

[deleted] • 3 points • 17 March, 2019 06:10 PM

It's men at the top of the attractiveness and economic scale that benefit the most.

Women generally can't ascend as high as men, but they also can't fall as far which is a much more real possibility than getting to the point where the glass ceiling makes a difference, and the bottom of the socioeconomic scale is primarily made up of men.

poppy\_blu • 6 points • 17 March, 2019 12:27 PM

Everything you say is true but i see ALOT of men around here blaming women for this, instead of blaming the 1% who shipped their job to Asia, made college unaffordable, held down their wages, etc.

TRP\_Hoplite • 4 points • 17 March, 2019 12:55 PM

White knights are as much to blame for the change in the sexual marketplace and most TRPers should acknowledge this.

And I think college is unaffordable in the U.S. due to our culture: most people are dumb with numbers, and play the game of trying to get into the best school as possible and borrow as much

as possible and worry about the consequences later. But with many people doing that, colleges can raise their prices even more encouraging more borrowing. iIT's my opinion, it's similar to the housing crisis in some respects.

reluctantly\_red • 3 points • 17 March, 2019 03:21 PM

White knights are as much to blame for the change in the sexual marketplace

Disagree. White knights have always existed. Indeed today the white knight strategy is less effective. Social media has made casual sex with super hot guys an option for all women who are at least marginally attractive. Pre social media a woman chose between the ever available white knights and whatever somewhat more attractive guys were available in her circle. Now the white knight must compete with the hottest guys in a much larger pond.

poppy\_blu • 3 points • 17 March, 2019 01:21 PM

What's responsible is women achieving equity and being able to support themselves and not having to marry losers to survive. That's a result of a shift from a manufacturing/labor economy to a knowledge economy, not "white knights."

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 March, 2019 12:55 AM

LOL! The amount of guys that complain that in the past they could have had a wife with their 30k salary, ugly-medium looks and boring personality but now women aren't forced to be with them to survive is so funny. Like, you want a woman to be forced to be with you? Okay.....

poppy\_blu • 1 point • 22 March, 2019 01:02 AM

Yeah I don't get it. The manosphere is full of men who admit they would rather be needed than wanted. But then they can't conceive of a woman ever wanting them and that's probably their biggest problem.

blackkindergods • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 08:12 PM

This is high level.. also, wanted women in the workplace pushing wages down. Just saying.

poppy\_blu • 0 points • 17 March, 2019 08:20 PM

Proving my point

blackkindergods • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 08:24 PM

Not at all. It's money at the end of the day, globalization pushing wages down, we need two parents working to afford kids now, think developed nations economists didn't realize how much more GDP would be gained. You just think anything with women mentioned is blaming women.

I wasn't blaming women, though if you wanna get defensive women deserve some blame here. I have coworkers with hundreds, thousands of matches, bitching how all the hot guys she's matched only want sex. She swiped left within fractions of a second on guys who aren't hot, then her and our other coworker explained to me "it's in the eyes" when I told them they're dumb af.

boomcheese44 • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:59 PM

Attraction can't be negotiated. Would it be "smart" for a man to choose an ugly woman? No, because its not what he wants.

blackkindergods • 1 point • 18 March, 2019 01:13 AM

Ya we all just mad at the game

Willow-girl • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 03:51 PM

You'll get no argument from me here.

cxj • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 07:22 PM

This is true but he overwhelmingly majority of husbands were unable to leave women for younger tighter hotter even if they did want to. It's not really a valid comparison. The rich men with options didn't want to divorce their wives, they added on to a harem with mistresses etc

Willow-girl • 1 point • 18 March, 2019 11:53 AM

Men back then didn't divorce their wives because it was too expensive! Have you never heard the phrase, "Cheaper to keep her"? D'oh!

No-fault divorce did away with that ... hardly anyone receives alimony nowadays. Even a woman who sacrificed her career to be a SAHM for many years may only get a little temporary support "until she gets back on her feet."

cxj • 1 point • 18 March, 2019 07:36 PM

Alimony was replaced by gratuitous child support "for the children."

"Sacrificed a career" is also usually bullshit because there's no guarantee that career would have been a success or made a lot of money , it's a hypothetical

diffdedbed • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 05:47 PM

Horrible analogy and not even all that valid economically, little own relationship wise.

While society has some major problems, and the rise of idiots who think socialism is good...again... will only fuck things up even more, most people seem to be living just happily.

Perhaps they stay out of reddit and don't realize just how unfair it is to be a married with children and how *horrible* for men it is /s.

crackrocksteady7 • 6 points • 17 March, 2019 01:21 PM

Do I enjoy the decline and let my house go to shit or do I take pride in the fact that I have a beautiful well maintained home? So who does it benefit if I decide to keep maintaining a beautiful home? It is not only my family, but my neighborhood as well.

a better comparison than that is, not enjoying the decline would be you paying to make THEIR homes beautiful and maintained. Because when you take on the self defeating trad roles, it doesn't benefit you, it only benefits others (who would not do the same on your behalf)

Willow-girl • 4 points • 17 March, 2019 11:41 AM

To extend the metaphor, *your* neighborhood may be going to shit, but right up the road is an UMC one where the houses still look nice. The families still consist of two married parents (generally college grads with professional

jobs) and their kids.

wtfellification • 3 points • 17 March, 2019 08:05 AM

well yes, it's an opportunistic consumerist culture, "grasp what you can while you can" and "if I'm going down, I'm taking you down with me". it's incredibly sad

RickWilsonsBuck 1 points 17 March, 2019 04:50 PM [recovered]

How is this comparable to someone just checking out?

wtfellification • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 05:59 PM

depends on why they're checking out. and to what degree they are checking out

RickWilsonsBuck 1 points 17 March, 2019 06:15 PM [recovered]

Why shouldn't matter. Checking out means not dating

wtfellification • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 07:19 PM

why shouldn't why matter?

RickWilsonsBuck 1 points 17 March, 2019 07:25 PM [recovered]

because why someone is checking out is not really your business, it doesn't impact you. kinda like homos in their bedrooms if you want to go that route.

wtfellification • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 07:32 PM

the reason why you are checking out impacts you, and you are impacting me

RickWilsonsBuck 1 points 17 March, 2019 07:47 PM [recovered]

How?

wtfellification • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 07:58 PM

well it's happening right now

[deleted] • 3 points • 17 March, 2019 08:09 AM

If your neighborhood is going to shit, chances are it's due to forces beyond your personal control.

If you want to extend your metaphor, painting and landscaping your property are not going to reopen the factory that supported your community.

reluctantly\_red • 6 points • 17 March, 2019 11:15 AM

The irony is that many of the people who lost their jobs when the factory closed voted for the pro-capitalist policies that screwed them. The American working class includes many brainwashed idiots.

Willow-girl • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 11:39 AM

Capitalism is the worst system ever ... except for all of the other ones!

reluctantly\_red • 3 points • 17 March, 2019 11:53 AM

There are tons of rich people and lots of successful businesses in places like Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. Capitalism per se isn't bad. However, its American form leaves much to be desired.

Willow-girl • 4 points • 17 March, 2019 02:47 PM

True -- it *is* excessively regulated!

reluctantly\_red • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 02:57 PM

Regulations aren't a bad thing. Imagine a football or basketball game without regulations (i.e. rules). We don't need less regulation we need more coherent and more effective regulation.

Willow-girl • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 03:40 PM

No, in some cases we simply need less (or less layers of) regulation. Although it's easy to see why it exists -- politicians have to create lots of jobs to reward their supporters, and inspector jobs are easy to justify.

Let me give you an example from my industry. Dairy farms are inspected by the feds, the state and by the processor who picks up our milk. All have slightly different rulebooks, but they're generally concerned with safety and sanitation, which I think we all can agree are good things in food production. However, why the redundancy of three separate inspections? It seems it would make more sense to set standards on the milk processors are allowed to accept, and let the processors ride herd on their producers if necessary. We have objective measures like bacteria and somatic cell counts -- if these are in the desired range, is it really necessary to inspect the facility? The proof's in the pudding, or in this case, the milk.

A side note: the regulations require us to maintain a separate hand-washing sink, equipped with soap and towels, for the inspector's personal use. Usually for the sake of convenience in plumbing, this sink -- called "the inspector sink" -- is sited right next to the large one that is used for filling buckets and washing calf bottles, etc. It's a mystery to me why the inspector can't use the general sink, but I guess it's easy to create a regulation when you're not the one bearing the cost.

reluctantly\_red • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 04:14 PM

You can probably thank neighbors whose sinks were so disgustingly dirty that they had to enact that rule. Regulations are to level the playing field by forcing the worst actors to meet minimum standards. They actually make it easier to be good ethical business person.

Salty-Bastard • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 05:09 PM

Then the regulation should read "a clean sink that a human can wash his hands in will be maintained on the premises". Separate sinks? Gtfo, sounds like Deep South in the 50's.

Willow-girl • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:59 PM

I'm all for appropriate regulations, but why the redundancy of three separate layers of inspection? Other than to create inspector jobs for somebody's brother-in-law?

Salty-Bastard • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 05:15 PM

Perfect example of inefficient big daddy government lining their pockets and destroying the little guy, but when Monsanto wats a blow job they just speed dial the FDA and they'll come a runnin'.

Salty-Bastard • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 05:49 PM

You would interested in Robert Lighthizer and his take on the situation at hand.

TRP\_Hoplite • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 12:28 PM

I've always viewed "enjoy the decline" to just be a cynical view of people's behavior and accepting that it's futile to fight the overall negative or unfair effects of social media, third wave feminism, affirmative action, etc. Yes, these things do have positive effects but the overall effects on society can be negative, or at least negative if you are a white male.

If you are in an avalanche it's futile to try and fight it, I think you are just supposed to try and 'swim' with it and stay above or as close to the surface of the snow as possible until you reach the bottom of the mountain.

Overall, I think social media is bad for society. Yes, it has a lot of benefits, but I think those don't outweigh the negative effects. Social media allows people to share whatever views they want in an echo chamber where any contrary views will be ignored or can simply be deleted. The root of any issue is rarely discussed because there are too many people just reacting superficially because something makes them feel good rather than consider something that is an inconvenient truth, too many white knights willing to comment or like vapid posts, etc.

DaphneDK42 • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 03:33 PM

This reminds me of an old Prince Valiant story I read when I was a wee lad. Prince Valiant was riding around when he stumbled upon the Last Roman in Britain. Stubbornly fighting to keep Roman Britain going. You are not working for the neighborhood on the hill. you are toiling for the ruins of a lost civilisation.

daveofmars • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 04:40 PM

You can keep your house maintained all you want, but if all the other houses around you are declining then your property value will fall and eventually you'll never be able to sell it.

So what are you going to do, cut your neighbor's grass, paint their house, trim their bushes? It's not your property.

The only reasonable position and practical strategy is to move. You can't change other people. You can't alter the way the winds are blowing. So if you don't mind your house's value declining then stay, and if you do then you'd better sell by next year.

But more to the point, people find joy in accepting the decline because it means they don't have to spend emotional energy worrying about it and there's no more pressure to take responsibility for it. The forces that drive society, the economy, and politics are far stronger than you. Your impact is negligible, and your ability to change the course of these complex systems is functionally non-existent.

So, for a lot of people, they advocate for finding yourself a comfortable spot, looking out for yourself, and finding peace in times of chaos.

[deleted] • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 05:04 PM

The best way I can explain my position against thinking this way, which to me is basically a defeatist attitude, is to use it in a real scenario in my life.

It is a realist person enjoying their lives even in face of adversity.

I live exactly in the situation you described... i am a economist in Brazil. I know our country is going into another 2 decades of recession and/or dictatorial government. And I am not worried.

I am preparing. I know what I am doing. And when the market crashes all my investments will skyrocket and let

me live somewhere else. Until then I am here enjoying the decline. It would be like helping those people to move out and use the money to get out yourself.

You forget something. Both me and TRP do not have the power to change anything. You cannot help those who don't want to hear. If you know things are going for a decline by your perspective and no amount of effort will change that, what do you do? You profit out of it. You... enjoy the decline.

TRP is just like that. It may be "defeatist" as it knows the limits of its own strength, but TRP is about using your resources the most efficient way to achieve what you want. The most efficient way is to let things go, because you cannot change it anyway. And profit out of it.

blackedoutfast • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 09:06 PM

burn down your whole neighborhood and maybe when it gets rebuilt it will be all nice and gentrified

poppy\_blu • 3 points • 17 March, 2019 12:28 PM

So how long before this thread devolves into a racist circle jerk?

[deleted] • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 12:47 PM

Muh Christian White Knight country (which is actually PAGAN in origin) is getting destroyed by them Muslim and Arabs who kill and rape my sisters /s

reluctantly\_red • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 04:18 PM

Us brown folks are just reasserting ourselves after several centuries on the defensive. That's the way the game is played. We're winning this round. :)

DaphneDK42 • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 03:04 PM

"White Knight" is a problematic term. It produces a feeling of otherness amongst the black knight community and POC knight community. And indeed "knight" itself is a gendered term. Which clearly is nazi-racist against transgendered a-sexual POC knights.

-TheGreasyPole-[M] • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 07:52 AM

Hi OP,

I've approved. Please make a small edit to your OP and then save it again in order to summon our automod comment.

jkonrad • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 08:25 AM\*

You think they're referring to society? I'm pretty sure they just mean that their life sucks. And even if they actually do mean that society is in decline, they're still just saying that their life sucks.

rus9384 • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 10:57 AM

Lol, enjoying that your life sucks is exactly last men's attitude. Ah, no. But Nietzsche also criticised them.

3vilg0d • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:12 AM

His life also sucked big time.

rus9384 • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:14 AM

But I can't say he enjoyed it. And he never thought he is ubermensch. He thought he is closer to a last man. Because his books is whining.



3vilg0d • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:33 AM

Did you read original German editions?

rus9384 • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:35 AM

No, I don't know German.

3vilg0d • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:39 AM

It's difficult to translate his books in English so it's difficult to understand his translated books. Also, he didn't use Aristotle methods while writing so it looks like he is whining.

rus9384 • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:46 AM

Well, the thing is, he was criticising things. But not like he was very willing to change the world.

3vilg0d • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:49 AM

Did Marx changed anything? It's only because people picked on his ideology that communism was realised. If people didn't picked on his ideology, he would be same as him.

rus9384 • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:59 AM

So, what was Nietzschean ideology? Ideology is systematic and Nietzsche seems to be against systematization.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 12:49 PM

I do, let me tell you:

LeJacquelope • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 08:28 AM

Pros: Its demise pretty much means an escape from not only hypergamy but also government enforcement of misandry, such as jailing abused men and also enforcing paternity fraud.

Cons: a decline and collapse of society would result in LOTS of women dying. To the point of creating a *shortage* of women...

3vilg0d • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 08:44 AM

a decline and collapse of society would result in LOTS of women dying

Men would be dying more if society collapses but it's impossible for it to happen in any nuclear power.

Collapse would only imply change in political structure to a more authoritarian regime.

LeJacquelope • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 09:16 AM

A nuclear power can fall apart. Where is the USSR now?

3vilg0d • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:11 AM

What was before USSR? Democratic Government collapsed and an authoritarian regime aka USSR was established.

The only example of Societal collapse is of Roman empire. USSR is only change in political structure.

LeJacquelo • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:26 AM

LOL no there was a Tsar dictatorship that ruled with an iron fist oh my God that's basic history and you don't know that? No wonder you don't understand how monogamy won out.

3vilg0d • 2 points • 17 March, 2019 11:34 AM

I was talking about interim government before October revolution.

LeJacquelo • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 06:19 PM

I don't care what interim government would have come up at that time, it was doomed in the face of the proto-USSR. They had too much momentum.

3vilg0d • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 06:26 PM

Nobody expected October Revolution to be successful even Lenin himself. They had failed in February Revolution previously. So, you can't say they had too much momentum.

LeJacquelo • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 06:49 PM

I think history documented well the fact that he misjudged the power of his own movement.

3vilg0d • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 06:56 PM

I doubt the authenticity of that well documented history of a country that was as closed as soviet union with their famed intelligence agency and any document regarding soviet union produced by west government have a high chance of falsehood.

If you are not satisfied with soviet union. You could take example of Mao Zedong. China did have a democratic republic before him and they retreated to Taiwan after their defeat in Mainland China.

CombatStacey • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:31 PM

Men would be dying more if society collapses

Why?

jax006 • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 09:49 AM

I dont understand your analogy.

"Enjoy the decline" in the RP sexual strategy context would be more analagous to something like this:

You live in a neighborhood and own a modest house that you can afford but cant afford much better. Everyone else in the neighborhood is somehow building extra garage additions and putting swimming pools in their backyards. Meanwhile you run a tight ship just to pay the mortgage.

You find out that everyone else in the neighborhood is using some kind of magic property tax evasion scheme that you could also easily use.

Now obviously if everyone in the entire locale stops paying property taxes, then the things that they fund like public schools will all go to shit.

Should you take the morally superior road and keep paying your property tax like a sucker? Or should you

"enjoy the decline" and use next months property tax to go on a vacation?

Atlas\_B\_Shruggin • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 02:30 PM

That is not remotely analogous to enjoy the decline, theres no "decline" in your scenario

jax006 • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 03:06 PM

The decline would be when nobody is paying taxes anymore and nothig is funded.

The analogy in OP doesnt make sense because enjoying the decline doesnt make your OWN position worse

CombatStacey • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 11:33 PM

I like your analogy.

Sir\_Koopaman • 1 point • 17 March, 2019 07:08 PM

If your neighborhood is shit, it might be wise to find a better neighborhood. You don't have to live in a ghetto out of pride. Same thing with MGTOW. The SMP is shit, therefore I will move out of it to live a better life. The red pill is just the blue pill with red lead paint, there's still the same simping for women and putting pussy on the pedestal.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 March, 2019 12:10 AM

That is a horrible analogy. A more accurate one would be...since all the other houses are becoming decrepit and I can't fix the neighborhood I'm going to fix my own house, make it the best house I can so I can enjoy what i have control over.

SeemedGood • 1 point • 21 March, 2019 02:53 PM

It's really just a recognition of the reality that women collectively set the rules of the mating game with their choice structure because women have gatekeeping power over access to reproduction to which men are consigned to react, not unlike most other sexually reproducing animal species on Earth.

So, if the rules women set with their choice structure are destructive to the fabric of the culture, the male choice is constrained to either following the destructive rule set and gaining access to the ability to reproduce, or resisting the destructive rule set and being denied access to reproduction.

The final state of either choice is the destruction of the fabric of the culture. So, might as well follow the rule set and "enjoy the decline."

That's not defeatest, it's just the Pareto-optimal strategy.