

In which I explain to MGTOW that he is MGTOW, and why.

December 26, 2014 | 148 upvotes | by [Whisper](#)

<http://www.redditlog.com/snapshots/1416693>

Copied and pasted for your convenience.

As for my metaphor, I'm saying that when men complain about marriage rape, while I agree losing most your shit and you children is horrible, I still don't see them dying of starvation in a mud hut.

How is that important?

The logical conclusion of this argument is that there one single most wretched individual in the world, and he is the only one allowed to complain, or to strive to better his lot in life. This is ridiculous. The fact that someone else has it worse is a non-sequitur.

Think of it this way. If I stab you in the stomach with a box cutter, and you are bleeding profusely, then you have a problem.

If I stab the guy next to you twice, or three times, or fifty-seven times, does that do anything to fix your problem? Does that make it one iota more bearable? No, it does not.

I don't see many western problems as that big of an issue and easily solvable, but are not due to human emotion and an unwillingness to bend.

Foolish and naive. Knowing what to do is only half the solution. Getting people to do it is the other half, and usually the more difficult one. People have a lot less control over their behaviour than most people think.

And I son't exactly care about those not getting enough of said pie because the physical world is a harsh place and luck has everything to do with your lot in life.

You don't care because you've given up hope. You feel like you have no chance at a pretty and feminine wife, a stable job with enough money to raise a family on one income, two or three children who respect and obey you, and a close-knit community with friends and acquaintances who treated you with courtesy. You don't feel like you are entitled to any of those things. If you were born in an another era, you would have. Not entitled to just get them, but entitled to chance to work hard and earn them. And if you did have that fair shot at those things, you'd be out there now, busting your tail to reach that goal.

THAT is why I say the male sex drive (along with, yes, the male urge to dominate or lead) is the engine that drives both the economy, and civilization. Men want high-quality mates for long-term relationships. Men want families and children, in societies where fathers are the respected head of the household, rather than a figure of derision.

You have given up on busting your tail to afford and support a family, because society was restructured to remove the rewards. Some very broken people looked at the rewards men got in exchange for their responsibilities, and called them "male privilege". Then they persuaded our society to remove them. It never occurred to these people that this was what motivated men to keep the power running, and the grocery stores stocked with food. That, to them, was just background stuff that happened automatically, because you had "an economy", which is their word for "somebody else does the dirty jobs, because I am

doing the important work of complaining about the Patriarchy".

So the rewards of fatherhood vanished, but the expectations remained. Is it any wonder you don't want the job now? You're not lazy. You're sensible.

I don't want the job either, not under these conditions. Fuck that. I'm going to bang sluts, get high, keep my money, buy expensive toys, and not have or raise children, not bankroll anyone, not contribute to my community or my society.

Because "my" community and "my" society aren't mine. They never were. They see me as an ATM. A special, wicked kind of ATM that they insult as they withdraw money from, because it's "privileged" and "greedy" for not giving them more.

My society does not give a fuck about one thing I want or one problem I have. Certain companies won't pay for women's birth control pills? Everyone loses their shit.

I want a job? I better figure out myself how to make that happen.

I want to get laid? The only thing my culture cares about is to make sure I am not "pressuring" or "coercing" anyone. Actually making that happen? That's my responsibility, and figuring out what I need to do is my responsibility, and when I figure out what I need to do, I'd better not say openly what it is, if that description hurts the feelings of real person.

Our society doesn't consider anything a problem until it starts hurting women. We have a metric fuckton of young men in their twenties living lives of involuntary celibacy, and our culture doesn't consider that a problem until they start reading something like TRP, and then it's a problem because, and only because, they say mean about women and hurt their feelings. We have a metric fuckton of older men in their thirties and forties, paying to support children they have been cut off from, and that's not a problem for our society until they stop paying, often because they no longer can, and then it's a problem because they are "deadbeat dads", and we need to hold them upside down and shake vigorously with a basket underneath them.

Some people need to figure out that if you give nothing to men, you get nothing from them.

That is why TRP exists. Our society has abandoned men, so we are starting to form our own social structures, our own communities, our own support networks. And we are loyal to the communities that support us, not the ones that just try to use us and cast us aside.

Now, if you tell certain people, most likely the SJW/feminist/BP crowd that, they say "oh, you're being overdramatic", "you have all this male privilege", "you have it good, because you live in America and aren't worried about where your next meal is coming from". (These are the same people who think overhearing a joke about dongles is a grave injustice that requires immediate action.)

But this is, ultimately, an excuse. They want to worry *about* men, never *for* men. Why?

Because men are the economic powerhouse. Men build things. Men produce wealth. If they admit men have problems, not just as people, not just as black men, gay men, or poor men, but as men, then there is a limit. They have to stop squeezing. They have to limit their demands. And their real goal is extract the maximum amount with a minimum of effort. Socialism, feminism, "social justice", arguments about fairness... it's all just a power play. They want more cookies. That's all.

The non-bakers want more pie. And the best way to do that is to gaslight the bakers. Make them feel inadequate. Guilty. Tell them they have "pie-baking privilege", and they better give away all the pie to cleanse themselves of this sin.

That is the real source of the rage against TRP. It supports men. Makes them stop feeling guilty. Makes them hard to control. Makes them not only want things for themselves, but feel like they can get them.

Comments

[deleted] • 73 points • 26 December, 2014 03:04 AM

All true stuff but it reads like I walked into the middle of an argument between you and someone else, and I have no context for it except that you want me to see you win.

[deleted] • 16 points • 26 December, 2014 04:06 AM*

Sounds like a dramatic speech at the end of a movie, but I still highly enjoyed it. A- Would read again.

AcrossHallowedGround • 7 points • 26 December, 2014 08:06 AM

Pretty well written, and a fun read, but I don't wish for these kinds of posts to become common place. It's the kind of thing that turns a sub into a circle jerk like /r/atheism. When only one view is considered or even represented, there's no way for it to look wrong, and completely eliminates healthy skepticism.

[deleted] • 5 points • 26 December, 2014 09:49 PM

This. And when you see transparent butthurt masquerading as analysis, that person should be thoroughly called out.

seethelight476 • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 04:16 AM

Why not argue to win? :P I agree a little grandiose, but was still pretty inspiring.

RedPillSafe • 50 points • 26 December, 2014 06:14 AM*

I've actually had this discussion with women of a variety of age groups ranging from early 20's up to 65 years old and always gotten the same reaction.

When I suggest that men work hard BECAUSE they expect to be recognized and rewarded the women look stunned.

Women believe that men just NATURALLY work to serve them. It's so deeply ingrained in their minds that men will always give them stuff that it never occurs to them that at some point there is a sort of collapse.

The Misandry Bubble covers all this.

It's like a Stock Market Bubble where women inflated their own value many times higher than they are worth and at some point the whole thing comes crashing down.

We haven't seen the true collapse yet, that's still years ahead of us.

Feminism is not immortal... it will die eventually.

vengefully_yours • 5 points • 26 December, 2014 09:09 PM

Feminism is the contagion that kills the host. The only way it dies is if the society infected by it collapses and leaves everyone in it wanting. Feminism springs from plenty, when they are no longer concerned with basic survival, they have time to notice someone has more than they do, and bitch about it. They are unwilling to put in the effort to achieve and create that plenty, do they bitch and whine until someone hands it to them.

They continue taking as much as possible without replenishing or giving back, and nothing can live that way for long. Eventually the host can't keep up with the demand and it dies, the parasite dies with the host as they both founder in the waste they created. A complete collapse is the only thing that will set feminism back, but

like a bug or disease of the mind, it can't be eradicated completely. When someone has enough to not worry about surviving, they will want what others have worked harder to get. Thus the cycle will continue.

sumdumguy-throwaway11 points • 26 December, 2014 03:47 PM [recovered]

when the collapse comes, it will be very, very hard on women.

I wonder if even then they will appreciate what they had before they pissed it away.

soulmatter • 12 points • 26 December, 2014 05:40 PM

No. Because after awhile, eventually, public education will come back and try to erase the oral history.

Ochreata • 0 points • 27 December, 2014 02:55 PM

Absolutely. Unless anarchy can finally take it rightful place as the only moral societal structure.

soulmatter • 0 points • 27 December, 2014 06:05 PM

Man, it's never been anything but anarchy. The only laws that matter are the physical ones. And even those can be broken under certain circumstances.

[deleted] • 9 points • 26 December, 2014 01:51 PM

Feminism is not immortal... it will die eventually.

I'm 24 and I wonder if I'll be still alive to see that day.

TekkomanKingz • 17 points • 26 December, 2014 03:12 PM

Oh you will see it. There are a little over 1 million WWII vets still alive and imagine the change they have witnessed over the years. 50 years is an eternity in terms of social progress in this country. Something will give before your time is up unless you get into a car accident or something.

yourlordgenghis • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 05:17 PM

Nice, I'm grabbing my popcorn!

milkyboon • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 10:23 PM

Awesome, I'm grabbing my coke! :D

You really gotta sit back and relax and see how it plays out!

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 December, 2014 01:29 AM

When is this collapse gonna happen?

mgtown • 2 points • 27 December, 2014 12:38 AM

Feminism's death will be seen by the bridging of gender gaps not spoken of by Feminism.
i.e.

Women will become >50% of the homeless

Women will have a lower life expectancy than men

Women will become >50% of the unemployed (not domestic home-maker but actual unemployed)

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2014 02:11 PM

It seems to be in its death throes as is.

garlicextract • 1 point • 29 December, 2014 08:36 AM

I'd love to believe this but... source? evidence?

garlicextract • 1 point • 29 December, 2014 08:32 AM

Women believe that men just NATURALLY work to serve them. It's so deeply ingrained in their minds that men will always give them stuff

This both disgusts and shocks me. Like aren't we all fucking human beings?

[deleted] • 12 points • 26 December, 2014 11:25 AM

They want to worry about men, never for men. Why?

Because men are the economic powerhouse. Men build things. Men produce wealth. If they admit men have problems, not just as people, not just as black men, gay men, or poor men, but as men, then there is a limit. They have to stop squeezing. They have to limit their demands. And their real goal is extract the maximum amount with a minimum of effort. Socialism, feminism, "social justice", arguments about fairness... it's all just a power play. They want more cookies. That's all.

This is probably one of the greatest summations of the male condition I have ever, ever read.

Unfortunately, because of the point you make, it won't change a thing.

Men need to show each other some solidarity, and reverse the laws fucking us over.

Feminists often bring out the "it was a *struggle* for women rights blah blah blah"

But if men are all powerful, stomping on women, then why would feminism be able to exist in the first place?

Don't back down from society men. Let's take it back

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 December, 2014 02:31 PM

Better, let's get the groundwork going for Society 2.0 when this collapses.

blandboringusername21 points 26 December, 2014 03:19 AM* **[recovered]**

Some people need to figure out that if you give nothing to men, you get nothing from them.

This is a great distilled insight about society today and the way it treats men.

the male urge to dominate or lead

As an older gentleman, I have many decades of experimental living, to coin a phrase. I've been a good leader at various times. It's not really about scaring people or punching them in the face until they do what you say. That's tyranny. Real leadership is about people, people, people. As a leader I got royally fed up with *people* and dealing with their daily crises and issues. But that's what the job is, if you want it.

I think the Red Pill way forward is economically MGTOW + some kind of safe sexual outlet for men + Vasalgel so we can finally *choose* when/if to have children.

Zenken13 • 6 points • 26 December, 2014 06:34 AM

I'm a bit older too, and I think you nailed it with your last sentence. It's basically why I think prostitution should be legal.

[deleted] • 12 points • 26 December, 2014 04:12 AM

A leader isn't a person who gets assigned to that role and people feel obliged to follow him.

A leader is one person other people follow effortlessly, they follow the persons example in order to achieve a common goal, not to get something out of them. Not every manager is a leader, I would even bet very few are.

A leader is a person who takes initiative and gets shit done, not the person who orders people around.

[deleted] • 10 points • 26 December, 2014 08:14 AM

More importantly, the job of the leaders is to make your community feel safe. Leaders eat last. For those with some spare time around I recommend watching Simon Sinek on his talk about why leaders eat last.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 09:18 AM*

Great video, totally worth my time.

blandboringusername9 points 26 December, 2014 04:19 AM* **[recovered]**

A leader isn't a person who gets assigned to that role

Actually that's how it happens sometimes. You get promoted at work (yay!) and it's part of the job. Good leaders learn and get better at their people skills over time. Bad leaders can't understand why nobody wants to follow them, assume they're all lazy assholes, and resort to bullying to get their way.

Actually not sure we're disagreeing about much though. I didn't choose to be a leader. Was thrust into that position and gradually build my skill over time, like any other skill. It was certainly never an ego thing for me. Just part of the job, and I did the best I could.

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 December, 2014 04:20 AM

I don't disagree with you, I'm just rambling, carry on.

goodboy • 1 point • 26 December, 2014 04:55 PM

Managers and leaders are two very different roles with very different responsibilities and expectations and should never be confused. People can have multiple roles the way people can have different hats and change out the hat depending on the circumstances.

seethelight476 • 26 points • 26 December, 2014 03:11 AM

Red pill sometimes treads the line in the suspension of "moral value" in order to fulfill your own sexual strategy and personal happiness.

Do we want to have to use social and psychological domination to get what we want in dating? Not really. But it's better than white-knighting.

Merry christmas everyone.

token_stache • 11 points • 26 December, 2014 03:52 AM

Using social and psychological domination doesn't both me at all. Why should it, it doesn't inhibit choice for anyone all it does is create attraction. We need to get over consider traits like ambition, domination and aggression bad things, rather things men need to use responsibly, and when it is very positive masculine traits.

AcrossHallowedGround • 3 points • 26 December, 2014 08:03 AM

The problem with "moral value" in the first place is that it's not set in stone. It can't be. Society changes, and

so do people. If it stays the same, it gets to a point where very few people are made happy by it.

And let me ask you this; if morals make most people unhappy, is it really all that moral?

seethelight476 • 3 points • 26 December, 2014 08:12 AM

Agreed. Most people are puppets and are ruled by what ever values and morals are in favor with the media and current political party. That being said, most people are unhappy in general.

Find what morals and values matter the most to you, and stick to it. Spend your time doing what makes you happy, even when people give you shit.

AcrossHallowedGround • 4 points • 26 December, 2014 08:17 AM

Heh. I don't even go by morals. I look at a situation and do whatever will bring the most net good. If I can advantage myself by mildly inconveniencing someone else, that's fine. If I can be a great help to someone else, and it only takes me a little while, I will do it.

Ganjgirlsandsteelies • 1 point • 26 December, 2014 07:26 PM

Sounds like utilitarianism. Anything you can think of they've already got a name for it.

AcrossHallowedGround • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 09:42 PM

Yeah, funny thing is with 7 billion other people in the world, very few people ever have an original thought.

johnnyann • 17 points • 26 December, 2014 06:56 AM

You have given up on busting your tail to afford and support a family, because society was restructured to remove the rewards. Some very broken people looked at the rewards men got in exchange for their responsibilities, and called them "male privilege". Then they persuaded our society to remove them. It never occurred to these people that this was what motivated men to keep the power running, and the grocery stores stocked with food. That, to them, was just background stuff that happened automatically, because you had "an economy", which is their word for "somebody else does the dirty jobs, because I am doing the important work of complaining about the Patriarchy".

That's your point. That's your thesis. Once you focused on this, the piece was fantastic.

[deleted] • 14 points • 26 December, 2014 09:43 AM

Two days ago I was on the subway, sitting next to this cute girl.

Immediately, as I've done for all my life (I'm 23), I made it my duty not to even look at her. I kept looking everywhere but in her direction. Half of the train was not existing to me. Suddenly it hit me : why in the world am I doing that? "because it's bad". Feminist mother. Conditionnement. "don't look at a girl or you are a pervert", "don't oppress girls", etc. But really, I'm a pretty cool and attractive guy so why not having a good time with a random good looking girl? I want it and that's a reason enough, but I bet she would want it too after a few minutes of small talk. That is NOT logical to hide and deny her existence, it does no good to both of us.

You talk about men being shamed, about how society makes them feel inadequate. I mean, I'm a *man*. Hell, WTF with this crappy behavior?

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 12:23 PM

For a second there I thought you were going to rationalize not looking at her because you're a "MTGOW" and don't want women or some shit.

[deleted] • 6 points • 26 December, 2014 12:36 PM

Well I am actually a MgtOW in the sense that I consider that my mission, my passion, my life... are more important than **women**.

However, **sex** is a basic physiological and psychological need that we all have. In order to be happy I believe one need sex.

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 December, 2014 12:54 PM

I agree with MTGOW in the sense of not getting married, having children etc. I don't agree with it in the sense of rationalizing that a healthy male doesn't need sex and some kind of socialization.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 December, 2014 03:37 PM

Yeah.

Bot bot bot bot bot bot bot botbot

DoxasticPoo • 1 point • 26 December, 2014 09:05 PM

Years ago I had the same thought. It's literally the first thought I had that brought me out. "This girl is all dressed up and I'm avoiding looking at her because I feel ashamed if I do... that makes no fucking sense!"

It was the beginning of TRP for me.

[deleted] • 7 points • 26 December, 2014 04:15 AM

"you have it good, because you live in America and aren't worried about where your next meal is coming from".

Same to the women. They shouldn't be rallying up trying to stop being housekeepers and become career women instead, because starving people in Africa have it worse

fastball21 • 3 points • 26 December, 2014 11:55 AM

Patriarchy: Restraining Males

<http://freenortherner.com/2012/05/29/patriarchy-restraining-males/?theme=suits>

Kill_Your_Ego • 4 points • 26 December, 2014 05:32 AM

Good stuff Whisper. With all the threads where people are claiming that TRP should help the newly unplugged understand reality better (while they claim this means no one should ever fuck their wife or girlfriend) these people should be upvoting the shit out of this.

Men create value. Women get fucked by valuable men.

THE END.

vortex • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 07:04 AM

It is a similar situation when guys attend gym for many months without any results in muscle gain. When they wonder why they haven't achieved anything, they are told different bullshit about eating 6 times per day, using a correct workout routine and increasing their working weights. They have a social pressure telling that they should definitely gain muscles by working out otherwise they do something wrong. As a result people either quit or finally find out a lie about professional bodybuilding and buy steroids.

The same thing with the whole society. It is expected that men work hard and finally accomplish the American Dream. When working hard doesn't give any results, men are told that they were unlucky and did something

wrong. Unfortunately, there are no such steroids which can give the results that men want. But at least it is possible to break the big lie, after which we have a choice: either continue working for the society which isn't favorable to us or quit supporting it.

I heard a good point once: anarchists are not those who march with flags, but those who don't pay taxes, avoid conscription and don't collaborate with the state. Like guerrilla warriors, it is just another good way to fight.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 03:27 PM*

Unfortunately, there are no such steroids which can give the results that men want.

I take it you haven't tried adderall? Will help you get through college and retain a boring job, at the expense of eating your soul and doing bad things to your heart.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 26 December, 2014 08:05 PM

What are you even talking about? Who are you even arguing against? I went to the link you posted and it is about a topic wholly unrelated to anything you said. You quote some guy but your link contains no posts from that mystery man.

RICCIedm • -8 points • 26 December, 2014 02:17 PM

This is the rantest rant ever. Everything you wrote is on the sidebar already. I don't see the point of posting this.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 December, 2014 03:28 PM

1. Nothing wrong with a rant.
2. A new perspective on an old opinion is still valuable.