

Hate is the new love

585 upvotes | 2 February, 2015 | by Archwinger

The Red Pill is often chided for the fact that its advocates “hate women,” and devote their lives to unsavory methods of manipulating these creatures that they despise, and see as nothing more than a set of moist holes, into sex. We’re often quick to defend ourselves, making the distinction that attempting to understand women and live life in the manner that benefits us the most is a far cry from hate, but I think we might be a little too quick to distance ourselves from that. Hate is one of the essential steps. Hate is how we get to awesome. If you’ve never hated women, you skipped a step. I’ll explain below.

Let’s take an average guy, Mr. Joe Redpiller. Joe looks okay, has a decent but not great job, has had maybe a few average girlfriends in the past but generally sucks with the ladies, and nowadays can’t get a date to save his life and gets laughed at, shooed away, and even sometimes called a creep when he tries. He’s generally nice, pleasant, doesn’t make waves, has a few friends he’d consider close, and lives kind of a quiet, average life. The large majority of men are like Joe.

Joe isn’t happy. He’s okay. He’s fine. He gets by. But he isn’t happy.

If Joe stays the course over the years, he will probably get a few promotions at work and be able to afford a middle class lifestyle comfortably, find a girlfriend late in life who he eventually marries, face a 50% chance of getting divorced, and even if he doesn’t end up divorced, will probably spend the rest of his days wondering why the hell nobody, not even his wife, respects him when he works so hard and is nice to everyone.

Deep down inside, Joe probably knows that’s his future if he stays on this course. Deep down inside, Joe knows that’s why he isn’t happy. He’s okay. But he’s not happy.

Joe wants to be more than okay. He wants what all men want: he wants women to adore him and men to want to be him. He’s realistic. He knows he’s not the world’s greatest human being, but surely, he thinks to himself, he can do better. Surely, he can at least get a few dates, get laid, have some fun – I mean, if meat-heads from the gym, drug dealers, and frat boys can get laid, why not Joe? He’s a decent looking guy, he treats others well, and he has a good job. He’s a decent prospect, right? But women laugh at Joe. Even the less hot ones. Hell, one time a fat chick poured her drink on him and high fived her friends over it. Women think Joe’s a creep, and he’s not even being aggressive at all. He’s just walking up and trying to talk to women, for cripes sake. The farthest he ever gets is maybe buying a girl a few drinks. She flakes when he asks for her number.

Joe knows he must be doing something wrong, so one day, on a lark, he goes to the internet, and he stumbles across The Red Pill. This is not what Joe was looking for. He wanted a magic trick. Something he could try out that might help break the ice with girls. Instead, he’s reading a story – lots of stories, actually – that sound eerily like his entire life. Everything The Red Pill says men ought to do to be successful with women sounds wrong, stupid, certain to get Joe into heaps of trouble. Yet all of that crazy shit is explained in a way that goes along with everything Joe’s ever experienced.

Joe is cautioned by the entire internet: don’t bother with that red pill crap. It’s just a bunch of made up junk for losers who can’t get laid and hate women. None of it works, and it’s just misogyny disguised as a male support group.

Yes, he’s warned, that Red Pill shit doesn’t work. Not on real women. Not on the good ones worth dating. Joe’s told that if he “becomes an asshole,” like The Red Pill advocates, he’ll just alienate women and ruin himself. He’ll have no chance at a real relationship.

Are there exceptional women out there that The Red Pill won’t “work” on? Sure, maybe. But the people

who tell Joe this don't understand. Joe has nothing to lose. Because these "good ones worth dating" -- these "real women" -- they weren't dating Joe before. They were laughing at him and calling him a creep, right alongside the rest of women. It's not like Joe is giving anything up if he alienates these "women worth dating" that are "too smart for The Red Pill." It's not like he had a chance at these girls before and now he's blowing it. He never had a shot to begin with.

Undaunted, Joe tries some of this red pill stuff, and lo and behold, our detractors are right. It doesn't work. People keep right on laughing at Joe. He's still a creepy loser, just like before. Only now he's a creepy loser who spends a lot of time at the gym, goes out every weekend and hits on just about anything that moves, and acts like an asshole. And people call him on it.

Joe's furious. At himself, at men, at women, at the universe. Mostly at women, because any person worth breathing ought to be able to see that he's a decent guy. Joe crosses the threshold. He really, really hates women.

Joe goes out for drinks now, not hoping to meet a girl, but just because he feels like a drink. Women are there, and he doesn't care. In fact, he's kind of rude to them. He says and does whatever he feels like -- whatever comes to mind. He pretty much just uses the women there for entertainment. Saying shit and doing shit, treating them like stimuli that just exist to amuse him. Touching a few -- almost daring them to blow him off with his aggressiveness. And these stupid chicks keep bothering him when he's just trying to have a few drinks, maybe with a guy friend or two, or watch whatever's on the bar TV. He doesn't care about them in the slightest. He's just shooting his mouth off and being a general ass. And suddenly one of them is grinding on his cock, smiling at him.

Joe gets laid that night. Easily. Joe gets laid twenty more times. Because hating women enables Joe to really not giving a flying fuck what they think. He just fucks their brains out, gets his rocks off, only bothers keeping the phone numbers of the hottest or kinkiest ones, and spends a few months doing what the old Joe would have classified as mistreating women. And they can't get enough of him.

Once the novelty wears off, Joe starts to see the pattern, he starts to understand, and he cools off a little bit. He doesn't really hate women any more, because he's figured out that they're really not that important. If he wants to get laid, he goes out and gets laid. If not, he does something else. He understands how women work, how the game is played, and he's moved on. But hating them was a crucial step to reach this point.

I suppose if we really want to split hairs, "hate" is kind of a strong word. A guy really just needs to be indifferent about women and stop caring. But in the modern sense, that's really what "hate" is. I mean, you're not going to go out and murder people. Fucking around with them in public, being rude, not caring about them in the slightest, having sex with them and never calling them again -- that's today's version of hate.

The next time someone accuses of you of "hating women," own it. Because they exist for your pleasure. The more you screw around with them, heedless of their feelings, the more they line up to fuck you. Are there special flower women out there who are exceptions to this? Doesn't matter. You have all the sex you can handle. And those special flowers weren't fucking the old you anyway.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Pornography_saves_li • 66 points • 2 February, 2015 07:30 PM

There's a nugget of wisdom in there that bears repeating...

TRP is hated, because we teach men that *women aren't that important*, I would not be surprised if that was the wellspring of all the female opposition to this thing..

revengeofthecrazy • 22 points • 3 February, 2015 10:11 AM

They know they can't handle their emotions and once you understand how they work, you can play them like a piano. They don't like that successful red pillers and PUA have the key to their holes.

Objectively, women are utterly defenseless against getting fucked and pregnant. They rely on social/moral constructs for protection to maintain their freedom and independence. Morally, that's probably a good thing, but they're taking it further than freedom: There needs to be a balance between "finding yourself", "having fun", "riding the cock carousel" and procreation/family. They've gone too far to a point where they're narcissistic egomaniacs that cause extreme damage to society. They can't control themselves and it's destroying everything. Men need to step up, understand the social/moral constructs (the fematrix) to wrestle the power back into balance. They won't give that power up easily so anything that opposes the fematrix is obviously demonized. But women have proved that their irrational, narcissistic nature is destructive to us all if left unchecked. Women would be equals to men, but there's a layer underneath their intelligence that makes them utterly insane (the procreational wildcard?).

I've been called a troll for this kind of statement because it's extreme. I was raised blue pill and I wish I hadn't come to this conclusion. If anyone catches a unicorn, I'd be happy, we shall clone it immediately. Until then, we know what to do.

Howasheena • 21 points • 3 February, 2015 02:50 PM*

You can really see the damage if you compare 1930 to 1990. Nowadays, the majority of men spend their teens and twenties alone and confused, while the hottest decile of men operates the carousel.

In their thirties, all the betas finally get women (ala marriage) but now they are contending with her dissonance about losing access to the top shelf... plus the inevitable day when an alpha male at work offers his bed and she's unable to resist "recapturing her youth".

Wasn't like that before. There were loners, there were affairs, but such things were not ubiquitous. Mothers sternly educated their daughters in how to choose "a good man", and their fathers vigilantly kept the bad boys away. And these "good men" who became husbands were not totally beta either, since they grew up before feminism and did not consider themselves to be powerless.

revengeofthecrazy • 7 points • 3 February, 2015 05:01 PM

Exactly, I agree. There are some men of this type left. I call them the "nice men". They aren't completely beta but they are keeping success with women out of their own lives because they live by a code that's useless to them. They are the ones who can't fully distract themselves with video games and all that stuff and they are suffering the most in this madhouse.

the99percent1 • 8 points • 4 February, 2015 02:02 PM

Thank fuck for prostitution and porno...

If you can become a self actualized man, then you'd quickly notice most things have a monetary

value and time efficiency.

Pay for that hb9 escort. She'll give you a good time at a fraction of the headache, time investment and shit tests.

User-31f64a4e • 6 points • 3 February, 2015 10:19 PM

Well said.

I'll just toss one more thing out there.

You don't interact with society; you interact with people. There is no such thing as society, it's only a concept. That means it doesn't matter what "society" thinks, since society doesn't have a brain and can only manifest in individuals.

There certainly social and moral constructs propagated by society; but in the end, it's only what is internalized in individual men and women that matters. And on that level, it is subject to being overridden by biology. In fact, that happens all the time - when women get wet for bad boys, when their y chromosome leads blue pill men uncharacteristically step up to the plate in a pinch.

So while society is stacked against men (well, it has been gynocentric since the days of the troubadours ...), it's only a collection of individuals. Romania was stacked against individual freedom, and then one day people had just had enough and the Ceaușescus were in front of a firing squad.

So use your TRP knowledge in your personal, 1 on 1 interactions with women. Don't preach it, but be subversive and plant little thoughts to wake blue pill men up whenever there is a good opportunity. The revolution is coming; help seed the ground.

revengeofthecrazy • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 10:23 PM

Agreed. I like to indulge in that thought: "This is it. It's happening as we speak." It may have happened before, and it may still be happening. Maybe in waves, but it's the tendency that counts, and we're on it. I think of it as dyeing my social circle red. It's not the same as painting it. Like you say, by planting thoughts in your best friends heads, you can bring them around without being a preacher. Since I've introduced the red pill to my circle of male friends, we've grown together into a unit, it unbelievable. The mindset and the camaraderie that we have now, didn't exist before.

RedBigMan • 8 points • 4 February, 2015 05:55 PM

Take women off the pedestal and you end up looking down at them. Partly because you can see them as human beings rather than demigods of sexual power... Also women are on average 5-6 inches shorter than men as well.

brotherjustincrowe • 6 points • 6 February, 2015 12:38 AM

That's the level of entitlement women have in this day and age. What we see as treating a fellow human being with common courtesy, they see as repulsive supplicating. Then when we stop caring about their stupid head-games, they call us hateful. Ever rejected a decent-looking girl only to have her freak out, or scream at you and call you a faggot?

The way you treat a girl if you want to get laid seems pretty much the same as you'd treat a guy if you wanted to get punched for being a disrespectful cock. Yet they're always saying "feminism is about equality!"

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 February, 2015 09:57 PM

Ever rejected a decent-looking girl only to have her freak out, or scream at you and call you a

faggot?

+1. In their world, it is impossible for a man to find them unattractive. Something must be wrong with HIM if he does not think she is the greatest thing since sliced bread. I blame the overly ego-supporting media. But that machine exists simply to induce more consumption by...you guessed it...women. Save your family by shielding them from the media and advertisements as much as you can.

Pornography_saves_li • 2 points • 4 February, 2015 06:12 PM

Nah. I'm a short guy. Very few women are shorter than me.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 5 February, 2015 02:14 PM

They're still shorter than you on human values.

brotherjustincrowe • 3 points • 5 February, 2015 04:26 PM

Feminists and betas are always beating the drum of "treating women like people" like it's somehow this big, revolutionary thing. Then, we do that, warts and all. And they hate us for it.



IllimitableMan • 279 points • 2 February, 2015 07:13 PM*

Great thread. The anger phase is necessary. I get tired of people bagging on newer guys for "being in the anger phase" as if that anger isn't legitimate. Sure, going full Elliot Rodger is not a place anyone wants to go, but that kid was mentally ill to start with and isn't representative of what the anger phase is for your typical guy.

Channelling your anger and hatred to better yourself and assign less value/power to the average woman - that's necessary to deprogramming and taking women off the pedestal. Especially when your whole life growing up was spent being indoctrinated to assign ridiculous amounts of value to women simply for existing.

The women (as well as feminists) are mad because they don't want men deprogramming and taking them off the pedestal. They want to retain their woman privilege. Their drinks and food paid for, attention given, their assuaging orbiters eager to fulfil her each and every whim regardless of her lack of graciousness. When betas start "becoming alpha" en-masse, women get alpha cock but the pool of beta orbiters dwindles. This prohibits them from living out their sexual plurality (alpha fucks/beta bucks) thus it is only instinctually rational for them to have a negative visceral response. To encourage beta men to stay beta, passive, complicit, downtrodden - because they directly benefit from these kind of men existing.

Women rely on pussy starved loser men to complement their sexual strategy. Women need loser men who don't understand the rules of the game so they can use them as walking wallets and emotional tampons. Men of power and social/Machiavellian competence are not as easily and readily exploitable. It is woman's instinct to exploit man for her gain. As Patrice O'Neal said "*women feel like they need to get something out of their pussy.*" If she's fucking you and not personally benefiting from it, she feels violated, raped even. Alpha men provide tingles, hot bodies, intense orgasms and a great experience. But they won't pay her bills. Beta men cannot provide tingles, but they complement the alpha by doing what he doesn't: gift giving out the ass, taking her on vacations, being her emotional tampon and listen to her witter on about whatever passing social concerns she has. These weak men are kept on the hook by nothing other than occasional "duty sex." And she does not enjoy this sex, it is her paltry payment for what the beta provides and she resents such a man because she must endure him penetrating her whilst she is completely devoid of sexual passion for said man. Crudely, it is prostitution in terms of value exchange, albeit it is far more expensive than actual prostitution. It is social convention that gives

the whole sordid ordeal an air of legitimacy.

Truly, women do not care about men's happiness. Betas in the minds of women exist to be exploited as a financial and emotional resource **and women do not want to lose that resource. The red pill is a threat to the feminine imperative/sexual strategy so they will attempt to discredit and lambaste it at all costs.**

Purecorrupt • 67 points • 2 February, 2015 08:42 PM*

I think one thing that I've realized in the past months is the phrase "people aren't against you they are for themselves".

It is in someone's benefit to preach to young people that going school, getting a degree, being nice, getting a career is the optimum strategy. But the children who follow this that grow into men do not realize that this not applicable in regards to sexual strategy and is really only suitable for stability. And who wants stability the most? Typically people already in power.

However the PC police, white knights, or whomever will refuse to admit this (sexual)strategy (nice guy) is false and try to reverse flip and say not being nice means one has to be an asshole.

The phrase has personally helped me realize while all the things I've done (degree, career, no debt, etc) have not negatively impacted me I was wrong to think that these things make me sexually attractive. My mother and father get to tell everyone their son is successful and feel successful (because it is beneficial to them in those ways). But it hasn't exactly resulted in panties being thrown at me.

IllimitableMan • 38 points • 2 February, 2015 09:08 PM*

I think one thing that I've realized in the past months is the phrase "people aren't against you they are for themselves".

That's a good phrase and I like it. Unless you've specifically made an enemy of someone, it holds true, so assume it of strangers.

My mother and father get to tell everyone their son is successful and feel successful (because it is beneficial to them in those ways). But it hasn't exactly resulted in panties being thrown at me.

If they're BP, the same people who say *"you don't want to get big like Arnold Schwarzenegger, it's vain!"* RP fathers ensure your sexual success from a young age. They get you into martial arts, lifting, and any charisma they have will rub off on you from exposure alone. Unfortunately most boys today do not grow up with stable alpha daddies around to show them the ropes. Instead, they must learn themselves. Some find the way and eventually get a handle on things, some rot, leading a mediocre life. Others self-destruct.

Purecorrupt • 18 points • 2 February, 2015 09:27 PM

My mother is definitely "dont do that you'll look like Lou Ferrigno". She definitely wanted to keep me her little beta son. I always kind of looked at her like she was being ridiculous.

As most people - my father had a mix of RP and BP. Most of the RP is attitude, but as far as actions go everything else was pretty BP. He wasn't into sports and didn't teach me any - something something hamster about his brothers always watching them when he was a kid. I did acquire some of his attitude which is very "fuck you"-like and although he bent over for some things he never did shit like "sleep on the couch".

Attitude isn't everything - You can't ignore the benefit/added confidence of being able lift heavy shit.

Too anyone else reading - don't ignore your sons need to express masculinity. I had great desires

when I was little wanting to play basketball / ride my bike / etc. This soon faded when I had little/or no guidance other than "we'll pay for it" and used all my excess energy in video games.

Howasheena • 4 points • 3 February, 2015 02:37 PM

If you're too cynical, you might miss the possibility that your father struck an optimal balance.

He wanted to remain in the picture, and he wanted amity with his wife, and he wanted to be proud of how he treated her and you. That must involve a mix of what we here would label as RP and BP behaviors.

I propose that some BP-like behaviors are acceptable and do not diminish your power, if undertaken from a position of strength with RPish attitude. If and when you want kids, and want a smart wife who doesn't make you nauseous when she offers an opinion, you might come to regard a light blue tint as a fair compromise with

Purecorrupt • 5 points • 3 February, 2015 04:04 PM

I was going to reply, but it definitely got too personal. It helped writing it out even though I deleted it.

But RP/BP sliding scale does seem necessary unless you can support yourself completely independently and aren't really interested in LTRs.

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 February, 2015 04:12 AM

I had great desires when I was little wanting to play basketball / ride my bike / etc.

I'm sending them to the wood shop.

cover20 • -1 points • 3 February, 2015 03:36 AM

Lifting to the point of getting very muscular when you're teenage can probably stunt your growth. Doing it to the point of good athletic performance helps growth.

So nothing wrong with vanity, but since men hit their stride starting at 25 anyway, I think it makes sense not to bulk up too much before 20 and risk less overall bone growth.

dan_legend • 10 points • 3 February, 2015 07:41 PM

getting very muscular when you're teenage

This is completely untrue as far as puberty is concerned. Prior to puberty I agree 100%, but when a person hits puberty you should be lifting the fuck out of shit, you get so much extra strength too from all those hormones, I was benching 300 lbs in high school when I was on the football team, I was blue pill as fuck but I haven't even come close to that bench max 10 years later. (Around 260 right now)

BluepillProfessor • 6 points • 3 February, 2015 08:42 PM

I bench pressed my max of 290 in High School in my late 40's after taking 20 years off of lifting and just about 6 months of more recent power lifting. The first time I tried that weight I crushed it- and smart ass tried to do it again. My spotter had to grab the bar.

I am pretty sure that was when I tore my left rotator cuff.

Would not recommend.

IllimitableMan • 4 points • 3 February, 2015 03:47 AM

I was 6'2 at 16. I'm now 6'3 (many, many years later.) Genetics, funny thing aren't they?

Adeus_Ayrton • 1 point • 5 February, 2015 08:59 AM

Lifting to the point of getting very muscular when you're teenage can probably stunt your growth.

They told me this when i was a teenager and stupid old me didn't lift. How i want to punch them in the face now.

unsuckable9335 • 17 points • 3 February, 2015 03:46 AM*

The phrase has personally helped me realize while all the things I've done (degree, career, no debt, etc) have not negatively impacted me I was wrong to think that these things make me sexually attractive. My mother and father get to tell everyone their son is successful and feel successful (because it is beneficial to them in those ways). But it hasn't exactly resulted in panties being thrown at me.

I was so dismayed to learn that my career, by itself, meant next to nothing to pre-wall women. I'm in a highly skilled profession at a young age and am making more than 99% of men my age. I have huge responsibilities at work. A lot of people depend on me. But alas, not a single pantie has been thrown at me.

If we were living in the 1950s, it would be different. Women needed providers then. I've concluded men no longer fill the provider roll. They're more like fashion accessories to women now. At least that's the way I see it.

What's funny is that natural alpha friends assume I am swimming in pussy because of my job. To them, it's a given. But they're projecting: if I was a natural alpha like them with my beta provider capabilities, I would be swimming in pussy.

[deleted] • 12 points • 3 February, 2015 04:14 AM

If we were living in the 1950s, it would be different. Women needed providers then. I've concluded men no longer fill the provider roll. They're more like fashion accessories to women now. At least that's the way I see it.

This is entirely dead-on. The man as the head of household has been replaced by a combination of government and television, imo.

bluedrygrass • 2 points • 5 February, 2015 02:07 PM

" The man as the head of household has been replaced by a combination of government and television"

And then we wonder why new generations are so fucked up.

Purecorrupt • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 04:05 AM

It may be why we've been told to follow these paths based on those presumptions, but at least you and I have figured out this out now.

unsuckable9335 • 8 points • 3 February, 2015 04:20 AM

I certainly didn't follow my career path because I thought it would lead to pussy. I did it for me. I did it because I thought that if I worked extra hard and was a good person, love was a given. After all, love is not something you study for or take classes on. You don't obtain it through diligence and planning. The fairy tale faux version of love we've been fed all our lives is that it just "happens."

But you *do* have to study for it (hence TRP). It *does* require diligence and planning, at least for a man to achieve love from a women. Unless you're a dumb natural alpha brute, then you just have that indifferent attitude women love so much by default.

Fuck that, I've thrown in the towel. I mostly browse TRP purely for educational purposes. I have no interest in actually applying the concepts.

Howasheena • 7 points • 3 February, 2015 02:44 PM

Still too cynical.

If you are good at your job, and if you wake up every morning thinking about driving to work and what you're going to when you get there, then congratulations: you've found a career that overlaps your natural passions.

That is a unicorn in its own right.

Your job and your other purposes (if any) are what makes you happy. Adding a women or two cannot make you happy if you are not already... and you've got that nailed down. That's the hard part. That's the part that so many people struggle with for decades ("what do I want to do with my life?!").

You are miles and miles ahead. You're self-contained and content. These ARE the good old days!

unsuckable9335 • 3 points • 4 February, 2015 01:10 AM

Thanks for the encouragement. I definitely do have that feeling that these are the good old days. I'm honestly very happy even though everyone thinks I'm depressed because I've never had a girlfriend, do not have friends and do not socialize. But I've got some pretty ambitious personal projects and they devour me whole. I don't have time to be depressed.

Vid-Master • 1 point • 4 February, 2015 07:09 PM

Don't worry about it, just keep doing what you enjoy.

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 February, 2015 08:20 AM

Sure relationships bring happiness and love, but they bring an equal amount of depression and misery. It's a roller-coaster ride and some people are more content without it.

Howasheena • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 02:40 PM

That's okay. Stay the course, keep socking away the money, and try to retain a little bit of your blue-tinted gentlemanliness intact. Eventually, after the wall passes, you'll have your pick... and some of the smarter ones will wise up and will know to look for a balance between asshole (i.e. RP) and provider (BP).

PookIsLovePookIsLife • 12 points • 3 February, 2015 04:30 PM

I'd argue Elliot Rodger was not in RP anger mode at all, but rather such a BP AFC that his confusion about why women didn't love him fueled his anger. RP anger mode usually stems from anger at the true nature of women, or anger you were lied to about this. If you watch any of his videos or read his writings, its clear he was a total narcissist with no understanding of why women were not attracted to him. Remember, he was a member of PUAHate forums.

If RP anger mode is an extreme RP view, then Elliot Rodger anger mode would be on the opposite extreme BP side of the spectrum in combination with mental issues.

IllimitableMan • 5 points • 3 February, 2015 04:41 PM

Good comment, makes sense. I'm inclined to agree.

brotherjustincrowe • 1 point • 5 February, 2015 04:26 PM

I agree, he hated PUAs and probably would have hated TRP as well. He was an extreme bluepill solipsist (and mentally ill besides).

Rollo-Tomassi • 35 points • 2 February, 2015 10:53 PM

<http://therationalmale.com/2013/11/06/anger-management/>

Anger is a Gift

One of the more common criticisms lobbed at the manosphere in general is that the men contributing and commenting are just angry.

It's the easiest reaction for men and women conditioned to feminine-primacy to retort with. If men are just "bitter", "burned" and "angry" it absolve them of really having to think critically about what those men are proposing. Anger is one of those easy answers for people who don't want to be exposed to things that either they don't have a real answer for (such as JBY) or are too comfortable in their ego-investments that they don't want to be forced into any kind of introspection that might challenge them.

So the manosphere is just a collection of angry men, shaking their virtual fists and venting their frustrations about their loser status, their tough luck or being on the sharp end of the SMP.

"There's a lot of anger towards women in the manosphere. These misogynists think all women are evil bitches out to take half their money, steal their children and force them into indentured servitude. I pity them, really I do."

Most appeals to anger read like some variation of this. While being an easy retort, playing the anger card is also a very useful social convention for the feminine in that it's so culturally embedded that it's men who display the most anger and therefore more believable. Anger is the perfect disqualifier for the feminine. Accusing a man of misogyny will always be more believable than accusing a woman of misandry because men are always just angrier than women.

Beyond the quick and easy dismissal of anger about anything even marginally critical a man might say about the feminine is an underlying conditioning that prompts people to it. By that I mean, to the majority of blue-pill plugged in people, anything critical of the feminine, by default, is rooted in anger. We can link this to women's default status of victimhood, but even relating the most objective observation of behaviors, psychology or social constructs pertaining to the feminine in anything less than a flattering light is automatically suspect of a male anger bias.

But are we angry? I can't say that I haven't encountered a few guys on some forums and comment threads who I'd characterize as angry judging from their comments or describing their situations. For the greater whole I'd

say the manosphere is not angry, but the views we express don't align with a feminine-primary society. Men expressing a dissatisfaction with feminine-primacy, men coming together to make sense of it, sound angry to people who's sense of comfort comes from what the feminine imperative has conditioned them to.

user_none • 11 points • 3 February, 2015 08:38 AM

My ex was a bitter person. Carried around a seething, bitter, nastiness for all time for perceived wrongs from years ago. She also never, at least that I witnessed, got really angry at anything at all.

Conversely, I've had my moments of anger. Get really pissed, work through it, it's done and I move on.

And, here's a quote I've kept in mind for years.

"Bitterness is like cancer. It eats upon the host. But anger is like fire. It burns it all clean."

Maya Angelou

Howasheena • 6 points • 3 February, 2015 02:53 PM

It's okay to be angry.

During the second wave of feminism, the rabble-rousers proudly proclaimed their own anger, and the alleged anger of all women.

They're mocking TRP for its anger but that's a natural step on the path.

First they ignore you. Then they mock you. Then they attack you. Then you win.

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 February, 2015 01:33 AM

Not going along with fem centric ideas.....ANGRY

amicocinghiale • 2 points • 4 February, 2015 11:56 AM

Rollo, I've read all of your main posts on RationalMale, and I got so much help from your blog, so I give a lot of credit to what you say: is this post worth all this attention?

I mean, it's true that the anger phase is necessary, and it's true that indifference and aloofness go a long way in relationship with women, but the message OP is delivering here isn't to get over the anger phase, it's more kinda "stay angry stay foolish", utter bullshit if you ask me.

Am I wrong here, am I misinterpreting this post or what? The post you quote here makes so much more sense, it's about anger *management*, not about *being a total angry asshole, don't worry, and everything will be fine*, that is what I read here.

Thank you for your support Rollo and keep it going!

[deleted] • 55 points • 2 February, 2015 07:00 PM

A guy really just needs to be indifferent about women

Truly the best advice to give a man who wants to be successful with women

IllimitableMan • 69 points • 2 February, 2015 07:10 PM*

A personality trait easily cultivated considering the abysmal quality of today's modern women.

unsuckable9335 • 10 points • 3 February, 2015 03:56 AM

pretending not to care is an intensely difficult thing to do for those that care the most.

but I get that you're just making a joke.

IllimitableMan • 6 points • 4 February, 2015 03:54 AM

pretending not to care is an intensely difficult thing to do for those that care the most.

"I ask not for a lighter burden but for broader shoulders."

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 February, 2015 03:35 AM

Doesn't take broader shoulders in this case. It's just got to be the right kind of indifference. Seeing women as a dime a dozen, and I mean actually seeing them that way without any self deception, allows you not to care about any particular women even if in the abstract you're busting your ass at work and the gym for them.

IllimitableMan • 1 point • 10 February, 2015 03:53 AM

You read it literally. It's a Jewish proverb that means

"I don't want things easy; I want the strength to overcome my personal struggles."

So not actual broader shoulders, lol. Anyhow I agree about not seeing women as special. Depedestalisation is something betas need to do to start off with. Eventually it becomes internalised and they don't have to actively try. "Bitches ain't shit" becomes a reflex.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 February, 2015 04:07 AM

I didn't read it literally. You responded to: "pretending not to care is an intensely difficult thing to do for those that care the most." Presumably, you meant that you don't advocate wishing that you actually don't care but rather that you have the strength to pretend.

I contention is that it requires no strength. You just need to authentically not care and the way to authentically not care is to see what TRP's been saying all along. Individual women do not matter even if you can care about women in the abstract, as either a goal or an indication of reaching your goals. Just seeing the truth does not require strength, just proper observation.

cover20 • 9 points • 3 February, 2015 03:43 AM

Being indifferent means you'll cross psychological barriers (or that would be barriers if you cared.)

What has worked for me is sensing those barriers, and crossing them on purpose. It's fun! And it demonstrates power to a woman because it has an effect on her. This show of power starts the wetness pretty reliably.

Howasheena • 2 points • 5 February, 2015 01:45 AM*

Yes.

Women ALWAYS reward boldness.

But it is not necessarily rewarded on the spot. Sometimes the award comes round the long way, in the form of clout with the other women who observed your bold act.

Or the reward is the planting of a seed that will blossom into a spontaneous text message, sent to you days or weeks later, "Hey you were hilarious that night, you gonna go back there this weekend?"

Whatever form the reward takes, boldness is ALWAYS rewarded.

dybr • 13 points • 3 February, 2015 02:54 AM

Can confirm: am gay. I'm swimming in pussy now.

darkstout • 18 points • 2 February, 2015 09:02 PM

Women already "hate" men. Every guy who has had a girlfriend talk shit about him behind his back knows this. And now feminism makes this hatred socially acceptable.

Romantic love is a beta's game. TRP teaches: do not love women unconditionally!

unsuckable9335 • 7 points • 3 February, 2015 04:04 AM

Women already "hate" men.

Granted, they hate women too. One might say they hate everyone.

brotherjustincrowe • 3 points • 6 February, 2015 12:39 AM

Either Mencken or Bierce defined a misogynist as "a man who feels about women the way women feel about each other."

unsuckable9335 • 1 point • 6 February, 2015 03:12 AM

I love that mencken is quotes on here. I love "Damn! A book of Calumny" and "In defense of women." loads, and loads of RP knowledge. and this dude lived in pre-feminist times, yet he still understood the dangers of women.

MentORPHEUS • 73 points • 2 February, 2015 06:53 PM

The opposite of hate is not love.

The opposite of *both* love and hate is indifference.

It's the indifference, not the hate, that "works." Get past the anger stage and to Amused Mastery; it will all make sense.

People randomly trying "red pill techniques" from the anger phase is the origin of much of the outside dislike for this sub and its philosophies. Not surprisingly, unprovoked anger does not rank much higher on the attractiveness scale than beta/blue pill behaviors.

jb_trp • 38 points • 2 February, 2015 09:34 PM

This.

"indifference" = outcome independence

Once you really don't care if that woman fucks or walks, but focus on yourself, you will become 1000x more attractive. The highs might not be as high, but the lows won't be as low, either.

I have no problem laughing in the face of some 21 yr old girl that is trying to beta shame me and telling her to GTFO, because I know how the world works. I was happy before I fucked her, and it makes no difference that all she was was a pump and dump. I don't need her. *Outcome independence*.

Plates only spin for a while, eventually they all fall and break. If you're spinning multiple plates, and have an abundance mentality, it makes it very easy to walk away. You retain all the power. *Outcome independence*.

If you're in an LTR, she's going to shit test you. Eventually it might be a nuclear shit test. You have to be able to say, "There's the door," or else you don't have the power in the relationship. Depending on how bad your oneitis is (easy to develop in a LTR), your body is going to release chemicals that make you feel heartache, pain, etc. Don't let her see this. You have to be indifferent--*outcome independence*.

[deleted] • 9 points • 3 February, 2015 12:05 AM*

As the ancient Stoics would say, the only real power we have is our power of choice. You can choose to let women affect you or not. But they don't do it themselves. You let it happen to you.

It is truly about indifference. If you concern yourself primarily with your mission and enjoying your life, they will come to you.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

NeoreactionSafe • 26 points • 2 February, 2015 07:04 PM

I think he's using "poetic license" to make a point.

The Feminists interpret anything short of slavish obedience as "hate". It's a binary love-hate world that a Feminist sees.

By not seeking approval it's "hate" in the womans mind.

By extension all MGTOW's are hateful. (even if lost in a forest with no one to see them)

Feminists want you to "Man Up" and then take their abuse, Submit, Be Beta.

brotherjustincrowe • 2 points • 5 February, 2015 04:29 PM

But if you do that then you're a "benevolent misogynist" and are insufficiently thankful for your life of slavery. Remember, a loyal slave learns to love the master's lash.

You'd think it was obvious feminism is a giant shit-test, it's a no-win scenario at even a cursory glance.

flipster14191 • 10 points • 2 February, 2015 07:02 PM

Much truth brother. Except I think complete indifference gets us in trouble. I think it's more along the lines of balancing the hate and love equally, so that we're not doing too much of one or the other. I'm having trouble being articulate, but hopefully I make sense.

What I really mean is, I don't think we should hate women, but the BP days are over, which throws unconditional love out the window

Archwinger[S] • 31 points • 2 February, 2015 07:21 PM

This is exactly it. You can't go out, sit in the corner, ignore everybody and wonder why women aren't flocking to fuck you. That's being totally indifferent, right?

The indifference you need to aim for isn't zero. It's the sum of +5 and -5, which isn't anywhere close to the same thing.

JayViceroy • 3 points • 2 February, 2015 11:12 PM

I disagree. I think it truly is indifference. When you love or hate, you show you care. Now if I want to go get some pussy. I know females have that. I'm indifferent to what they want because I want sex.

But once you realize there's not only one girl willing to give it to you, the value you place on each interaction is very low if anything at all. By being indifferent or showing the IDGAF attitude (in essence saying she's worthless to you), the girls give it up to prove to you they have value.

[deleted] • 2 points • 5 February, 2015 08:29 AM*

You aren't disagreeing with /u/Archwinger, that's what he is saying. True indifference is going out to the woods and building a cabin by yourself, or just sitting on Reddit not going out at all to talk to people. If you were actually indifferent, why even go to a bar to get a drink with mates? Doing it at home is cheaper. MGTOW is "indifference". "I couldn't imagine giving a shit about what women want, I'm doing my own thing."

What you are aiming for is "perceived indifference" and it's a masterfully delicate act to balance. It might seem incredibly simple because you're so good at it, but it's really difficult when your penis is screaming at you, and that is after you get passed the approaching/talking to women part first, which is a feat in and of itself for most men.

jcprta • 1 point • 2 February, 2015 08:51 PM

Well, partly that.

But I'd say it's more complicated than that:

There's a dearth of written material that explains redpill philosophy. There's precisely nothing that covers everything in any real detail; I suspect such a book would wind up being about a thousand pages long.

The internet has fostered a tendency to always look for the TL;DR version. Problem is, RP ideas are so extensive that a quick glance through the sub is pretty well guaranteed to give a warped view.

There isn't much of an emphasis on self-improvement in the actual posts themselves. The sidebar reading material has such an emphasis, but the majority of posts don't.

trway14 • 2 points • 3 February, 2015 08:16 PM

There's a dearth of written material that explains redpill philosophy. There's precisely nothing that covers everything in any real detail; I suspect such a book would wind up being about a thousand pages long.

Not everything needs to be covered in detail. When teaching any subject, you are always transferring mainly *a way of thinking*. University physics textbooks don't cover all topics, nor do they contain great detail - they teach the basic theories plus how to apply them. Students can then apply that way of thinking to their fields of interest.

All you need to get a guy started is a few well worked out examples of common situations broken down in red pill theory. He'll then be equipped to work the rest out himself.

[deleted] • 0 points • 3 February, 2015 03:52 PM

There's a dearth of written material that explains redpill philosophy.

You're getting downvoted because you aren't reading the sidebar material.

jcprta • 5 points • 3 February, 2015 06:51 PM

I'm reading every word.

The problem is you can't point at just one short article that says it all because there's no such thing.

You can't even point at one short book, for the same reason.

There's no TL;DR simply because you'd lose so much detail it'd be meaningless.

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 February, 2015 07:04 PM

Yep, no TL;DR. No soundbite. No pithy catchphrase to memorize in lieu of tons of reading and

thinking. Nothing to plaster in big font above some funny picture of a critter.

You missed a word in the comment above

There's a dearth of written material that **succinctly** explains redpill philosophy.

I suspect it isn't possible. Here's an attempt at a summary of the topic of increasing one's SMV. This is not even an explanation, it's an index. Consider how much of TRP this excludes - how much of TRP is about things other than male SMV. Then take one of the subsections. Then one of the one word summaries in that subsection. How much could be written about that? Random example:

TRP -> SMV -> Male SMV -> Game -> Day Game

How small of a piece of TRP is that and yet how much could be written about day game?

jcrpta • 2 points • 3 February, 2015 07:50 PM

I'm absolutely certain it isn't possible.

The absolute best you could do would be to explain that RP is a philosophy that tries to help men enjoy greater success in life - particularly their sex life - by adjusting their behaviour to account for how the world actually works, not how the movies would have you believe it works.

RP ideas are never presented in a sugarcoated form or diluted in any way, simply because the target audience actively does not need that.

[deleted] • 11 points • 2 February, 2015 09:47 PM

Very astute observations. The opposite of love is not hate, it is indifference. And women often confuse the two and perceive indifference as "hate".

Hang on, gonna go grab some Elmer's Glue for this post. Great material.

Cant_Tell_Me_Nothing • 10 points • 2 February, 2015 09:05 PM

Indifference by itself can get pretty boring. This is why teasing her and treating her like a joke works so well. It's the fun aspect of being indifferent.

PlanB_pedofile • 5 points • 3 February, 2015 07:15 AM

The biggest blessing the redpill had on me was when I stopped caring about women the women began to take interest in me.

I'll be polite to women just like I'm polite to guys but I don't apologize, call them out on their bullshit, and seem unphased by their shit tests.

Had ine gal try describing to me this alpha dude she was bangin. Testing my reaction. While going on about his 8 inch dick I began to pull out my Facebook and checking out the newsfeed. Ignoring her cock fantasy, she got huffy at my lack of interest.

"Just what are you doin?" "Just messaging this chick I've been talking to. She'll be coming over for a movie"

" Im free tonight" trying to regain my attention. "You can be my plan B" i reply with a smile

Women do weird shit.

BluepillProfessor • 0 points • 3 February, 2015 03:53 PM

"You can be my plan B"

Bonus points for the double entendre.

X346 • 5 points • 4 February, 2015 02:34 AM

Understanding The True Nature of Women By Napster

I thought I'd write a submission to give my views on some of the common themes of the Stickman website. Essentially, I want to talk about a topic I've always been fascinated with - the psychology of women. I think many of the problems people on this site write about boil down to wishful thinking and fundamental misunderstandings about the nature of women.

Having been involved with quite a few women in my life, both in long and short-term relationships, as well as friendships, I often find myself observing their behaviour. I've also read a lot on this topic, from seduction literature, to feminist writings, to academic studies. Here are some of the key points I've found.

Number one is to realise that women think very differently from men. They are not the same as us, and you must see that they won't view many situations in the same way as you do. Their motivations are different.

The ultimate aim of male / female relationships is reproduction. That is why your body drives you too seek out sex and relationships. It's also why women's bodies do the same thing. Our bodies are emotionally manipulating us in the hope of reproductive success.

What do men want from women? Mostly love, sex and companionship.

What do women want from men? The same three things, but also financial support and physical protection.

The best reproductive strategy for women is to gain all these things from the same man. But that isn't always available. So instead, an alternative strategy might suffice. That is, to use one man as a provider, and another as a sperm-donor. There have been plenty of observations of females cheating on their long-term male partners in the animal kingdom. In fact, the sneakiness with which the females do it is almost laugh inducing. They can fornicate behind a bush silently and quickly, while their ignorant male partner is only metres away. There is also quite a lot of evidence of this occurring in humans. Actually, you'd have to have lived a pretty sheltered life not to have realised that this type of behaviour is pretty widespread.

Men aren't entirely stupid, so we've developed behaviours to counter this. The main one being an easy emotional trigger for extreme jealousy. Women have counter-played by becoming extremely secretive. That's why it's almost impossible to get a straight answer out of women concerning their feelings on sex and relationships. They instinctively attempt to make themselves confusing. It's also why they become outraged at any attempt to control their sexuality and reproduction.

The bottom line is that you can't trust women to be honest with you about their feelings. They are hard-wired to hide such things from you and that's just how it is.

Which brings us to the topic of love. Women talk about love all the time, but it's not really love as we understand it or as Hollywood sells it. Instead, what women are interested in is infatuation. Their love is almost always fleeting and hormonal. That's what they mean when they talk about "chemistry". Men also suffer from infatuation, but also experience real love. It's common to meet men who are deeply in love with their wives decades after marriage. To see the same in a woman is much more rare.

The author Michelle Langely wrote a fascinating book on this topic called "Women's Infidelity". A few years after marrying a husband with whom she was madly in love, she began to lose all feeling in her relationship. Curious about this, she interviewed hundreds of other women to find that this phenomenon is very common. In fact, she found that after a few years, many women felt less for their husbands than they did a stranger in the

street. These women resented the commitment they'd made and the obligations they were under towards men with whom they no longer felt any connection at all. Sound familiar?

One of the most confusing things for many men is how quickly a woman's view of you can change. One day, she can be singing to the heavens about her undying love, the next she can throw you away like yesterday's newspaper.

Another author F Roger Devlin, reviewed Langley's book and theorised that there is a biological basis for this. Children have better chances with the support and protection of a father during their early years. So women are emotionally wired to stick with a man during these formative years. After this, they may well have the best reproductive strategy by spreading their bets - that is, by finding another man. Remember, these instincts developed on the plains of Africa, rather than in modern society.

Onto my final topic of financial support. When you peel back the layers designed to hide it, it's hard not to come to the conclusion that prostitution is everywhere. Of course, it's obvious on the streets of Sukhumvit, but there's plenty of it going on in the suburbs of the West as well.

What is prostitution? Quite simply it is the flow of funds from one person to another in return for sex and companionship.

In almost every male / female relationships this flow goes from the man to the woman. In the world of the "good girl", women can be a bit choosier about who their customer is. Their need for financial support typically isn't urgent. They also play a longer game and one where society ensures what's really going on is covered up in layers of romanticism and euphemism. Indeed, many women don't even engage in this game consciously. It's in their nature and their emotions drive them towards it, while their rational mind happily uses every excuse possible to ignore it.

So instead of a direct cash payment, she accepts dinner invitations and gifts of jewelery. She then gets a big wedding with lots of gifts and a honeymoon. Once married, she often starts working part-time or gives up work altogether. Their joint funds get spent on things she wants such as big houses, renovations and shopping trips. Finally, if she gets a divorce, she expects a big financial settlement and ongoing support of various types.

The process is more subtle, and society's genius in hiding and encouraging it is clever, but make no mistake about which way the funds are flowing. It's nothing more than socially acceptable prostitution, and it's everywhere. Of course, these women would deny it until they are red in the face, but cut off the flow of money and they'd screech like stuck pigs.

This arrangement suits men as well. Most men would be as ashamed of using prostitutes as women would be of being accused of being one. It's much better we all pretend that what's really going on i.e. men paying for sex, companionship and access to reproduction, is something else entirely.

Most women are, at base level, prostitutes. Most men are Johns. It just suits us to pretend otherwise. In fact, most people would be outraged if the true nature of their relationships was exposed, no matter how clear the evidence.

Are there exceptions to this rule? Absolutely. But they are not common.

Of course, the best excuse of all is children. The need for children to be supported can be used to blur the flow of funds more than ever. One thing I notice when I visit the large shopping centre near my house filled with supported wives is that the number of products sold to benefit children is minuscule. The vast majority of products are aimed at women. Men may earn most of the money, but it's pretty clear who it's being spent on.

So there you have it. I could go on, but I think I've made my key points. Armed with this knowledge, I hope the Stickmanites can better manage their relationships with women. Once you really understand what's going on, you can more easily protect yourself financially and emotionally.

Understand that a woman's feelings for you are likely temporary. Understand also, that she will almost certainly

expect, even at a subconscious level, that you owe her financially for her time. If the funds aren't forthcoming, she'll likely use any tools at her disposal to extract them.

Napster

Waldo00 • 1 point • 4 February, 2015 06:14 PM

The wife is supposed to still around and raise the kids with you. A John can't really be counted on for anything more than a dick and some money. There is value to relationships. Problem is women have the power, and an incentive to leave and take everything and men have grown up with a belief in the traditional arrangement when the modern women is a danger.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

unsuckable9335 • 2 points • 3 February, 2015 04:05 AM

I'm going to say that the next time I'm accused of being a misogynist. Should be any second now ...

my-redpillthrowaway • 3 points • 3 February, 2015 07:43 AM

I don't know man. I never went through the anger phase. Maybe it's because I found TRP at a young age (21) or maybe it's the fact that I grew up in a traditional environment and the first thing I learned as a child was men and women are different - I never bought into the feminist bullshit. Or maybe it's because I am a religious person and never made a conscious approach to get laid - didn't experience getting rejected by a woman.

Whatever the case, I am glad I didn't go through the anger phase. Being in a state of anger is the total opposite of happiness. Guys in the anger state should work to fix it- so that they can be happy.

[deleted] • 3 points • 4 February, 2015 04:06 AM*

Men get angry discovering RP truths because the Disney tale they grew up with and what society raised them with didn't work.

It's kind of like the speech Tyler makes in the movie Fight Club:

"We've all been raised on television to believe that one day we'd all be millionaires, and movie gods, and rock stars. But we won't. And we're slowly learning that fact. And we're very, very pissed off."

It's like that but he forgets to mention women.

I think red pill is very good for men and for humanity moving forward. At some point women will go through their own anger faze and will be forced to adapt to all the men out there who are no longer going to cater to the feminine imperative.

The interesting thing is how this will happen and how long it will take to happen. You still have white knights and male feminists out there who fight for the Disney tale and feminine imperative. RP will have to reach these men somehow.

These men only do this for female attention and hope for sex which they never get. Once they see that there is no real benefit to what they are doing they get angry enough which leads them to RP or at least PUA.

But for feminists there will come a point where they see what they are doing from a sexual strategy isn't working. Men will never want to fuck fatties or unattractive women, no different than a women will never be attracted to a beta.

The biggest audience to reach for RP is for the majority of men who are beta males and are sucked into the fairy tale and feminine imperative. This way they understand that working hard for female attention and sex is

worthless.

The unfortunate thing is for a lot of men who have read RP material is they have already been bitten in the ass by blue pill. Hence the reason for the "anger phase".

The ultimate goal I think for RP is to get as many men as possible working towards evolving as men and helping men show and lead women to what is acceptable behavior and what actually helps and supports men. Women need to evolve back into the role of supporting, loyal and nurturing.

Feminists just don't understand that they can be supporting, loyal and nurturing and still be a powerful independent women too. This is how relationships will best evolve from here on out.

But it starts with men being men again. Understanding that we cannot put women before our purposes in life. When women see that there is nothing more important to you than your goals and she is attracted to you, the sex and all the nurturing/support is a byproduct because that's who females are at the core.

Men at their core are at their best working towards a goal that helps themselves grow or helps humanity grow.

Feminists think of it as a negative. Hopefully they can evolve past this and realize the feminine imperative holds humanity back from being it's best.

nesshie91 • 2 points • 3 February, 2015 01:36 AM

I'd like to think that I equally hate & love women.

highman86 • 2 points • 3 February, 2015 09:07 AM

It is also worth mentioning that not everyone goes through the anger phase. Some people don't have a blue pill reality to wake up from, me included. No loss of reality equals no anger phase.

cooltrip • 2 points • 3 February, 2015 01:09 PM

sorry to ruin your speech, but success with women doesn't have to do with your aloofness to women, it only has to do with your handsomeness and physical superiority and qualifiedness. Once you physically qualify, it doesn't really matter whether you are a bad boy or a nice guy, you're getting pussy anyway.

Archwinger[S] • 6 points • 3 February, 2015 01:51 PM

Partly true.

You must meet a woman's minimum physical standards before you can even say hello.

However, a totally hawt guy can fuck things up pretty quickly if his game is awful. It's not like a girl doesn't have other, cooler guys giving her offers.

Plus, a (normal) woman can only fuck one guy each night. Multiple guys who meet the physical qualifications distinguish themselves from each other by not sucking.

cooltrip • 4 points • 4 February, 2015 11:14 AM

The problem is most redpillers think once you have game, then you don't need looks. They don't understand looks are NECESSARY, only not sufficient. They think if looks are not sufficient, then they are not necessary either. TRP places an emphasis on game that should be placed on looks. Looks are the important thing, game is secondary and residual; but redpillers think it's the other way around.

amicocinghiale • 1 point • 4 February, 2015 11:48 AM*

I second this. The part about being indifferent and aloof sounds true to me, but this one

He's just shooting his mouth off and being a general ass. And suddenly one of them is grinding on

his cock, smiling at him.

Joe gets laid that night. Easily. Joe gets laid twenty more times.

is mere non-sense. I'm surprised this post got so many upvotes, it doesn't say anything new nor does explain in depth some TRP truths, it's just a short story about an angry man, with a weak (still kinda valuable) ending to wrap it all.

Maybe I should only read the sidebar material, really good posts are becoming so scarce in this sub.

edit: added a word

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

MattyAnon • 2 points • 4 February, 2015 08:03 PM

Women consider 80% of men to be "below average".

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 February, 2015 12:52 PM

Good for you OP. I always feel very proud of myself when I'm able to take the initiative to end something I know is on the way out.

archaeopter • 5 points • 3 February, 2015 04:02 AM

Here's the real problem I have with "the red pill":

He wants what all men want: he wants women to adore him and men to want to be him.

I don't want either of these things. I don't want any woman to mindlessly "adore" me and I sure don't want other men to want to "be" me. I want to be myself, I want you to be yourself. If we get along, great. If not, see you around. I see no reason to try to manipulate people into getting along with me.

There's this underlying thread that the key thing that men must want is some sort of social adulation from both men and women. I just have no interest in that whatsoever.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

Archwinger[S] • 6 points • 5 February, 2015 11:50 AM

Tell me about it. It's no fun being so awful. If women would only quit fucking guys like this and start chasing the good ones, the red pill would completely disappear.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 06:24 AM

Im going out this weekend. Gonna try this shit...

Weaponbychoice • 3 points • 3 February, 2015 08:04 PM

If you have the desire to try (the word implies your mind favours one outcome), you've already lost.

manwhowouldbeking • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 07:01 AM

I would not say hate, i don't hate a snake or a spider for in its nature it is venomous it is doing what it is supposed to do. Such is the way i look at women in a different light, before i saw them as something they were not but the blinders are off. Is a wolf evil for killing a lamb, i dont know these survival strategies seem to be

working for women, the red pill allows me to see things as they are. I can't be angry with predators.

applesaucejenkins • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 05:27 PM

Is it possible to never go through an anger phase, but rather, go straight to indifference?

Archwinger[S] • 3 points • 3 February, 2015 05:30 PM

You're missing out. If I kick you in the nuts and you just shrug and resign yourself to having sore balls for awhile, you're a pussy, not an aloof winner. It's the journey that gets you there, not the endpoint.

applesaucejenkins • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 06:47 PM

I'm not a very emotional person. Would you consider an attitude of "fuck that bitch" or flirting with her friends in front of her just to get a reaction to be part of the angry phase?

Archwinger[S] • 3 points • 3 February, 2015 07:12 PM

Sure. You're doing what you feel like, just for fun, heedless of her feelings. Her reactions are just something that amuses you. You don't really care.

That said, be certain to do what you want. Don't focus on trying to make some girl react. What do you care how she feels? Just go do your thing. Her presence or absence shouldn't matter. You can screw around with any woman.

applesaucejenkins • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 10:20 PM*

That's why I'm asking. I've been doing that for some time now but don't remember going through an angry phase where I went out and fucked everything that moved. It was more like I didn't want anything to do with them. I suppose everyone internalizes their angry phase differently though.

I went through a phase where I didn't want anything to do with women, not really even sex. I became happy on my own in monk mode, then realized that I couldn't give a shit less about what women thought because I simply didn't need them.

RunawayGrain • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 05:47 PM

"What you fail to understand is the power of hate. It can fill the heart as surely as love can." -- Captain Nemo

fiffi89 • 1 point • 2 February, 2015 09:04 PM

I partially disagree with what you have written. There is no magic attitude. Indifference helps but it is not the magic pill. Beta men usually continue to remain beta and alpha men usually continue to remain alpha.

This means that alpha men are happy and beta men will be sad for life? Hell no. Beta men will be happy once they learn to accept themselves and love themselves even when they lose. This is the trick.

QQ_L2P • 2 points • 2 February, 2015 11:54 PM

To accept yourself you have to be indifferent to the vast majority of opinions others hold about you.

Whether that indifference comes from the confidence positive reinforcement of your actions (alphas) or learned (ex-betas) is irrelevant. But having it is one hell of a drug.

unsuckable9335 • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 04:08 AM

Hatred, love, indifference, anger -- all ranges of emotion are useful and should be a part of a Red Pill man's arsenal. There's no magic attitude which you need to maintain to become successful in life.

But I don't think OP is saying there is.

cover20 • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 03:46 AM

It's not so difficult. It's easy to be alpha, and I think you're a troll. Total of 3 posts I see.

Is this thread getting you wet?

BluepillProfessor • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 03:43 PM

"hate" is kind of a strong word. A guy really just needs to be indifferent about women and stop caring.

Arch is arguing the same thing because the opposite of "love" is not "hate." The opposite of love is "indifference.

This information does not apply to all but the special snowflakes. It applies to all of them. AWALT.

How many marriages are a low sex living hell of denial and Shit Tests until the man finally reaches his limit? THE INSTANT the husband decides that he really doesn't care any more- that his IDGAF persona is no longer an act is when things change. The SECOND he falls out of LLLLOOOOOVVVE and becomes indifferent- not angry or full of hatred, just indifferent- is the instant the frigid wife suddenly starts getting those little rippling vaginal tingles.

Nycredpilldad • 1 point • 3 February, 2015 06:21 PM

Shouldn't you be over in MRP welcoming all the women you invited to come talk about RP & giving away flair like Oprah?

feelinglazy • 1 point • 4 February, 2015 01:06 AM*

This sounds like red pill porn. I doubt hitting on women when hating them is going to get you anywhere. The goal of TRP is to get over the anger phase and move on to acceptance.

Edit: This dude sums it up nicely here: /r/TheRedPill/comments/2ujgdz/hate_is_the_new_love/co8ybea

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

QQ_L2P • 3 points • 2 February, 2015 11:57 PM

Once the novelty wears off, Joe starts to see the pattern, he starts to understand, and he cools off a little bit. He doesn't really hate women any more, because he's figured out that they're really not that important. If he wants to get laid, he goes out and gets laid. If not, he does something else. He understands how women work, how the game is played, and he's moved on. But hating them was a crucial step to reach this point.

Literally the third to last paragraph. Did you get bored half way through and not read the entire thing?

chrisindub • -3 points • 3 February, 2015 05:25 AM

I got bored with this whole angst riddled, beta post about how much TRP guys struggle with their inability to deal with life, then saw that you used the word "literally" in its pre-2014 definition, and it lit a small light of hope for the TRP community.

[deleted] • 0 points • 4 February, 2015 09:23 PM

What you are describing is contempt, not hate.

"Hatred and contempt are diametrically opposed and mutually exclusive. There are even not a few cases where

hatred of a person is rooted in nothing but forced esteem for his qualities. And besides, if a man sets out to hate all the miserable creatures he meets, he will not have much energy left for anything else; whereas he can despise them, one and all, with the greatest ease. True, genuine contempt is just the reverse of true, genuine pride; it keeps quite quiet and gives no sign of its existence. For if a man shows that he despises you, he signifies at least this much regard for you, that he wants to let you know how little he appreciates you; and his wish is dictated by hatred, which cannot exist with real contempt. On the contrary, if it is genuine, it is simply the conviction that the object of it is a man of no value at all. Contempt is not incompatible with indulgent and kindly treatment, and for the sake of one's own peace and safety, this should not be omitted; it will prevent irritation; and there is no one who cannot do harm if he is roused to it. But if this pure, cold, sincere contempt ever shows itself, it will be met with the most truculent hatred; for the despised person is not in a position to fight contempt with its own weapons."

Arthur Schopenhauer

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

stevredpill • 14 points • 2 February, 2015 08:52 PM

It's a bird! It's a plane! It's...Literal-man!

nuc22 • -4 points • 3 February, 2015 04:36 PM

The opposite of love is apathy, not indifference.

s0und0fyell0w • 4 points • 3 February, 2015 07:43 PM

apathy and indifference are synonymous.

PlebDestroyercomment score below threshold • -10 points • 2 February, 2015 08:55 PM

So raising SMV, playing the numbers game, and having social freedom isn't going to get you laid...This shit is getting more and more complicated. I'm going back to GLL.