

From Middle Class to Concubine Class

April 19, 2015 | 154 upvotes | by [jacks1000](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Black-Pill • 21 points • 19 April, 2015 02:22 AM

While it is men who are most often accused of dropping down to the lowest common denominator in the sexual marketplace, I think that you (and history) prove that not to be the case. As you point out, women (like all humans) crave power over the world they inhabit either large or small. The realization, for women, that the power they crave can be achieved by circumventing traditional avenues (such as hard work, for example) by simply using sex to get what they want, point to the obvious conclusion that it is women, not men, who constantly lower the bar in the socio-sexual dynamic.

jonewman • 58 points • 19 April, 2015 05:42 AM **[recovered]**

Here's a trick. You want to see into the future.. take a look at Black America.

fap_the_pain_away • 20 points • 19 April, 2015 01:41 PM **[recovered]**

But who will pay for everyone's welfare then? Serious question.

aguy01 • 8 points • 19 April, 2015 05:27 PM

That's the point. It's the Cloward-piven strategy. Overwhelm the system with welfare and it collapses, then a new government can be instated.

WhenIntegralsAttack • 14 points • 19 April, 2015 03:29 PM **[recovered]**

Be careful. It's questions like this that will lead you to become conservative. Better not worry about that like the rest of us.

jonewman • 20 points • 19 April, 2015 05:07 PM **[recovered]**

My principles are only those that, before the French Revolution, every well-born person considered sane and normal. - Julius Evola

...

Conservatism is the idea that all of our problems are known, and the solution to each is the same: people need more self-control and morality, and we need to pick those with the best self-control and advance them above others (similar to martial and athletic competitions) so that those more sensitive instruments can make decisions. This idea arises naturally from the notion of improvement. We don't need new methods; we know what methods have worked for time immemorial. When we promote good people, and demote bad people, society thrives. To do that, we need a strong moral standard; for that, we need a strong national culture and strong religion. For that, we need a goal and direction. For that, we need a founding transcendent idealism, like the notion of improvement and thus conservation.

...

Conservatism exists as a term only to describe what is not-liberal. When the liberals first seized a European state in 1789, the congress in that State separated into left-wing, who supported the new ways, and right-wing, who wanted to retain as many of the old ways as possible. To liberals, conservatives are evil; to conservatives, liberals are misguided and incompetent. They are civilization destroyers. The right wing has been staging a rearguard retreat ever since because conservatism is less popular than liberalism and always will be.

People on an individual level respond more energetically to pleasant visions with an emotion (not factual) basis. Ideas like equality, freedom and pacifism appeal to all of us because they abrogate the struggle of life, which is Darwinism itself: the struggle to adapt. When civilization is founded, adaptation switches from reality to civilization itself, and with that, decay begins.

This does not mean that civilization is bad, but that it must be aware of these problems, much like we still use fire and internal combustion engines despite the possible dangers associated with them.

Liberalism succeeds because it creates fanaticism. The thought of what “should be” swells people with a sense of purpose, which appeals to the vast majority of humans who are — since we are speaking frankly — evolutionarily unfit for anything but subsistence living. Left to their own devices, they ferment the potatoes and eat the seed corn, then exist in perpetual alternation between apathy and starvation. Never forget our glorious simian heritage and the fact that most humans want to return to that state if they can.

The right has no such fanaticism. Its members merely want to adapt to reality and set up the best society they possibly can. This goal does not break down into issues, talking points or ideology. It is a gut-level instinct that incorporates as well the highest function of the brain, which is integrating and synthesizing many issues into a big picture.

Liberalism denies the big picture by replacing it with ideology and attacks the conservative majority on “issues” by looking for exceptions which are presumed to invalidate rules. The ultimate goal of liberalism is to abolish all social standards so that the individual is unconstrained by any accountability, and yet can still enjoy the benefits of civilization. It fails because liberals do not understand time and how over time, society changes with liberal alterations and what is left offers few of the benefits of civilization.

Conservatives create 18th century Europe; liberals create 2015 Brazil.

...

Liberalism has one basic tenet, which is egalitarianism. All of its many theories exist in support of this and for no other reason. A nihilist sees liberalism as advertising, the same way big companies push each other out of the way trying to donate to third world rescue missions, inner city education, peace-in-our-time etc. and other “populist” notions which pander to the emotion need of the herd to escape risk. The crowd wants to avoid conflict because its individuals fear being losers. It forms a warm buzzing hivemind around any idea that argues that conflict is unnecessary and can simply be bought off. Its core is submission in order to avoid losing.

This philosophy gains the epithet of civilization destroyer for a simple reason: liberalism creates a feedback loop where egalitarianism separates intentions from their consequences in real world, causing disaster wherever implemented, but the zombie ideology recognizes only a lack of egalitarianism as its enemy, so it pushes for even more egalitarianism. The solution to the problem is more of the problem. Liberal societies follow the Franco-Russian pattern: glorious revolution, many happy things, then pervasive and unshakeable social and economic problems doom the society to third-world status, at which point it launches wars to mobilize its citizens toward productivity.

Amerika

ChairBorneMGTOW • 6 points • 20 April, 2015 02:21 AM [recovered] [recovered]

People on an individual level respond more energetically to pleasant visions with an emotion (not factual) basis... Liberalism succeeds because it creates fanaticism. The thought of what “should be” swells people with a sense of purpose, which appeals to the vast majority of

humans

Yup. I view intelligence as a bell curve.

The lowest end of the bell curve, the dumb-fucks of society, can do no more than observe and react intuitively. But the funny thing is, observing Liberalism makes one react intuitively against it. So they're conservative.

The middle of the bell curve has imagination. They can picture what the world SHOULD be like, and it burns thier sphincter to realize that it's not what they want it to be. So they get utopian fantasies. And thus, they're liberal.

But the top of the bell-curve can predict the second-order effects of these fantasies acted out. They realize that the intuitive reaction has a basis in reality. And so they're conservative.

The tragedy is that the middle of the bell-curve is more populous than both extremes put together. So we're ruled by the ignorant, self-interested mediocracy of liberalism. And transitively, we're all fucked.

systemshock869 • 4 points • 20 April, 2015 05:05 PM

But the top of the bell-curve can predict the second-order effects of these fantasies acted out. They realize that the intuitive reaction has a basis in reality. And so they're conservative.

Or they stand to gain from the liberal agenda and have no issues with the homogenizing and dumbing down of the general population, because on their high horse they are immune from the negative implications.

U96Q69 • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 04:11 PM

Look at how petrol dollar works; it is a rabbit hole.

trpadawan • 16 points • 19 April, 2015 11:12 PM

In some ways I agree, but I think modern Japan is actually a better indicator of where America is heading.

You see, Black America is hyper-masculine. High-status alpha males have lots of money, guns, and gangs of lesser (but still tough) men to defend them and be in their "crew." They say all sorts of derogatory shit about women and nobody bats an eye, least of all the scores of women that they fuck on a regular basis.

Do you think feminism would ever allow that to happen to White America? Feminists own the media, and they do everything in their power to shame men for expressing any hint of politically incorrect masculinity.

If a black rapper talks about fucking hoes, he gets worshipped, but if a white guy says "she wants it", he gets branded as a rape advocate. So I don't think Black America's love of masculinity can get translated into White culture at this point. We're too far gone.

Meanwhile, take a look at Japan. There's an entire class of men who have decided not to pursue sex, as you may have heard. As America becomes more dominated by feminist dogma, it will be more "acceptable" for American men to do this too. In a way, it's already happening, there just isn't a word for it over here.

It will probably come down to some weird combination of the two. The true, high-status alphas will be allowed to fuck whatever concubines they want and they'll never settle down. A slight majority of men will be betas who are just manly enough to get locked down by post-wall concubines that want kids. And the rest of men will choose to swear off sex entirely, because at least they have porn and video games.

This became a bit of a rant, but my main point was that Black America is more masculine than future White

America will ever be allowed to be.

kaiwanxiaode • 8 points • 20 April, 2015 05:49 AM

there just isn't a word for it over here.

It is sort of what MGTOW is.

rp_valiant • 3 points • 20 April, 2015 09:04 AM

I think the right word over here in the west is "incel", or "forever alone". There's a whole host of people who self-identify as these labels and spend their time moaning about how they could never land a girl, rather than actually applying themselves to doing so.

razor5151 • 5 points • 20 April, 2015 01:48 PM

No offense to American redpillers, but reading posts like this really boosts my morale when I'm feeling down about living in a third world country(India).

Yes we have a lot of problems, a low quality of life, pollution, overpopulation, but atleast our society knows how to keep hoes in line.

trpadawan • 1 point • 23 April, 2015 11:51 AM

Just wait 'till your country gets more developed and becomes more cosmopolitan. It's an inevitable part of civilization's "progress."

razor5151 • 1 point • 23 April, 2015 02:23 PM

Yeah thats what i'm scared of..

Barely_Intrepid • -3 points • 20 April, 2015 04:48 PM

You cucks always talk about blacks being more masculine. Nobody ever explains how their dependent lifestyle of constant peacocking is "masculine".

They're obsessed with status and hypersensitive to insult, real or percieved, because their *image is all they have*. That's how women behave!

Masculinity is the expression of responsibility and self sufficiency. Masculinity is leadership and creating. Blacks are whollu dependent on other races for their very survival, they are a sociological equivalent of an ungrateful child completely dependent and resentful of their parent who provides housing, food, and allowence. What the fuck is masculine about that?

joneyman • 3 points • 20 April, 2015 06:12 PM [recovered]

nah. see Masculinity is simply strength and competence.

strength and competence can be expressed in many ways.

Physical Masculinity is just the most visceral expression.

generally speaking..

the black race is a race of superior physicality and athleticism.

The Übermensch of any race is one that can identify how they lack, and improve where they lack.
in every race, there is something to be admired.

Barely_Intrepid • -1 points • 20 April, 2015 07:11 PM [recovered]

Haha sure bro.

I'm in awe of the physical superiority of the black race. It's amazing how black warriors have been victorious against.....nobody. Even the arabs managed to enslave millions of them.

They're so supirior they manage to suffer from every measurable health malignancy at vastly higher rates than any other race, consistently wherever they reside on earth...an epidemiologists dream! Haiti, a country almost eentirely of physically supirior blacks, their #1 export is physically supirior dead bodies used in medical studies.

They are pretty good at putting a ball in a basket though, totally worth the trillions of welfare, ruin of great cities, crime, and the general bullshit that goes with dressing apes in human clothing and pretending we're equals.

This isn't a fucking MMO where all the races are balenced for parity. Go admire the fuckers in their natural habitat. But dont drink the water, after 50,000 years, you'd think they'd have figured out not to shit in their water supply.

jonewman • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 08:15 PM [recovered]

but if every black man was as righteous as Ali and Malcolm X. if the black race understood how to build and organize...

Barely_Intrepid • -2 points • 20 April, 2015 09:03 PM [recovered]

Too bad we don't live in a world of *IFs*.

Here on Earth, mother nature is a cunt who has no time for charming ideas like fairness, equality, and human rights. It's interesting you used the term Ubermenche, You ever actually read Nietzsche? How about Heidegger? Evola?

These guys had zero hangups on the notion of the Ubermenche rising from a European ideal. Blacks were, and continue to be a brutish incarnation of the Last Man. Idiots who, without support, rapidly devolve into their primitive state. Go to worldstar for a first hand account of what that looks like.

Then read up on what the Ubermench actually is, infer for yourself what he is not.

trpadawan • 1 point • 23 April, 2015 11:55 AM

No, you're imposing your own cultural values onto what you think masculinity is. It's much simpler than that. Read "The Way Of Men" by Jack Donovan and you'll start to get an idea. The primitive gang lifestyle *is* masculinity. The "leadership and creating" part that you mentioned is just a productive application of that in a modern setting, but it's not the only way.

To quote Rollo, "Alpha is as alpha does." It's not as easy to define as you'd like to think.

Btw, opening up with "You cucks..." is bound to make you seem less intelligent.

Barely_Intrepid • 1 point • 23 April, 2015 02:12 PM

Starting a reply with "No,...." is bound to make make you seem like an ass.

I've been reading Donovan for years on counter-currents and have well worn copies of The Way of Men, A Sky Without Eagles, and Androphilia on my bookshelf. I have great respect for his insight and its very encouraging to see his name becoming more mainstream. He is also gay..... this is actually a huge deal when discussing masculinity. His idea of a high männerbünde reflects his Internal disconnect from the drive men have *for* women. He openly ackacknowledges this bias

in interviews. He simply *can't* understand man's internal desire and private relationships with women as a gay man. Examine his work with this in mind.

Jungian psychology has some very interesting things to say regarding manhood and personality types associated with masculinity and Alpha character. Notions of the "shadow" personalities associated with masculine traits. Directly linked to "Alpha", the idea is simple, a truly developed man is a leader, underdeveloped men take the "shadow" forms of the leader to mask weakness, avoid responsibility, and avoid growth, oscillating between the two forms based on the situation. These personality types are the passive victim and the aggressive/domineering asshole. Both are quick to anger, sensitive to criticism, weak, and beta.

Extrapolating on these types, the African model of masculinity is the opposite of the passivity of the man-boobed suburban children of femininity. It's appealing to the sensitive nature of such people but is ultimately just a overcompensation mechanism and just as weak, though in a different way.

I've always advocated for the study of masculinity from a rational and results based approach. Examine the traits of successful men in successful societies and learn from them. Black society is decidedly unsuccessful. The quote "Alpha is as Alpha does" is true in the context of a resource rich society without competition or accountability where anyone with a cocky mindset can masquerade as Alpha without any consequences whatsoever.

Alpha means leader, leadership means responsibility. My main criticism of feminism is the notion women deserve to dictate the responsibilities of men (I.e. assume leadership) while responsibility remains with men. Women logic.

"You cucks....." is appropriate when addressing passive bitches admiring the behavior of their polar opposite permanent children while missing the whole point.

trpadawan • 1 point • 23 April, 2015 07:02 PM

You should have put this comment as your original reply. This is actually well thought-out and was worth my time to read. Overall I think this is another one of those examples of the inherently subjective nature of "alpha" and how different people see it, as well as masculinity itself.

It's interesting to consider your "successful men in successful societies" example, and I'd say there's certainly some truth to that. But I'm not so quick to write off Donovan's more primitive definition, nor am I so quick to write off successful men in Black culture as inherently insecure and childish. I absolutely see where that view would come from, given the way many people in that category act. However, to say that an Alpha male defending his pride is the result of insecurity sounds awfully close to feminist shaming tactics, e.g. "Oh he must just be overcompensating for something." The idea that responsibility = manhood also sounds like feminists when they claim that men who choose not to get married are "permanent children" for doing so.

Regardless, you've given me some food for thought.

Barely_Intrepid • 1 point • 23 April, 2015 07:55 PM

You present an interesting point with the similarity between my argument and common feminist criticisms. When they chastise men for avoiding the responsibilities of marriage and (unrelated) male posturing as the result of insecurity.....this is effective because their arguments contain an element of truth, however the truth is predicated on foundations that

no longer exist.

Keep in mind, im taking this argument directly from Donovan. Donovan argued that man's responsibility to "be good at being a man", has largely disappeared with modern technology. Men and women are only as good as they *have* to be. We live in a world where men can be weak and women can be whores without consequences. Fuck moral judgements, we evolved in circumstances where weak men resulted in the death of the tribe. Men who avoided committing to raising a family resulted in the death of that family, etc. Traditional family mores maximize the efficiency of the larger tribe and eventually society. For women, this meant having and raising strong children and maintaining the man's home.

The feminist argument wants men to retain their traditional responsibilities and accept that women will not..... it's hypocritical and manipulative. TRP has done a fantastic job delving into the evolutionary motivations behind this behavior. i would ask the young men who would be "alpha" to examine their motivations critically and act with purpose, not simply be inverse parodies of the feminists themselves.

I was motivated to get something on paper, but this deserves way more thought than i have time atm. Thanks regardless

trpadawan • 1 point • 24 April, 2015 03:39 AM

The feminist argument wants men to retain their traditional responsibilities and accept that women will not..... it's hypocritical and manipulative. ... i would ask the young men who would be "alpha" to examine their motivations critically and act with purpose, not simply be inverse parodies of the feminists themselves.

Well put; I fully see where you're coming from now. That paragraph is a knowledge-bomb. If you were to ever expand this into an essay or full-length post I think it'd be worth your time.

[deleted] • 79 points • 19 April, 2015 02:33 AM

You're not wrong...but if you're celebrating this recent development, you're a fool. This is a return to a primitive order, a return to savagery. The winners have always had an extra woman or three, but this is different. This is decay.

jacks1000[S] • 32 points • 19 April, 2015 02:44 AM

this is different. This is decay.

Yes it most certainly is - for the White formerly middle class.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 01:09 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 20 April, 2015 02:21 AM

Everyone should be a race evangelist—for their own race. It just so happens that the race of conservative white Americans is drawing its last ragged breath. It probably shouldn't surprise you to learn that this subreddit is comprised of a majority of the alienated sons of their conservative white American forefathers.

AFPJ • -1 points • 20 April, 2015 04:18 PM*

That's fine, it's already hellish for white people. I was passed up last month for a lucrative (short) consulting contract in favor of a - get this, shit's so stereotypical I can't believe I'm saying this - part black, part native American woman. The contract is for business development, I'm a successful owner of three profitable ones, she has 0 & 0 experience.

Imagine the outrage if quotas prioritized Whites over Indians or Asians in African Countries or India?

You can't. Because it sounds so over-the-top retarded, why would anyone do that ...except the USA.

Ironically, "diversity initiatives" end up devaluing the accomplished individuals who are minorities. Being in business, I'm after one thing: capable people who do good business. I don't give a flying fuck if they're black, white, Indian, Asian or Bob the five eyed extraterrestrial. But with all the aids available for or prioritized / allocated exclusively to minorities, I can't tell if they have that business because they're consistent, smart and motivated or because they're a minority.

garlicextract • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 06:11 PM*

If it's "hellish" for white people, try being a model minority (Asian or Indian). All of the lack of Affirmative Action policies combined with and none of the SMV boost of being white - in fact, you're significantly, not marginally, worse off in both areas.

A tear rolls down my cheek for you poor white folks.

AFPJ • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 07:05 PM*

Hardly an accurate comparison, but I understand why you didn't make one. An accurate comparison would be what you say vs being White in virtually any non-white majority country: If you're salaried, there will be no quotas to get you a job because you're White and if you're an entrepreneur your business will be robbed and harassed - even by customs & the cops. It's factors of magnitude worse than being Asian/Indian in USA. In Africa, whites are just killed.

That comparison is silly is because who the fuck wants to move there from U.S./Canada or a Nordic or Scandinavian Country? Nobody. I wonder why. Almost like there's something politically incorrect people don't want to talk about...

garlicextract • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 07:24 PM

True. Didn't mean to sound snooty in that comment but I think the point remains.

AFPJ • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 07:58 PM

Indeed it does: it's an accurate & a damn good one. I can't refute it - Asian/Indian minorities are worse off than Whites in the US as far as SMV goes. Indians probably have it the worse of everyone, but I don't think SMV can be institutionalized ...it just IS. I probably should've clarified that I'm talking more from an economic standpoint.

On the topic of "model minorities", Jews are certainly a fascinating one. SMV aside, their income, status & other metrics in the U.S. are astounding when compared to every other demographic. A corollary to your point would be that, China is an exception to whiteness being tolerated in non-white countries: it works pretty good there.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 07:14 PM

Race evangelism seems to have its opponents even here. My comment was deleted, and not by me.

Rhunta • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 06:10 PM

But if you don't keep the middle class satisfied. How do you expect to control them.

joneyman • 10 points • 20 April, 2015 01:21 AM [recovered]

Since when do satisfy and control have anything to do with each other?

You sedate the working class. Entertain and distract them. You suspend them in an alternating state of apathy and decadence. Give them their internet and their celebrity culture so they live alone in quiet desperation, medicated and separated from each other to hide the ugly symptoms of a system built to drive them insane.

That's control. America will make you her bitch if you can't take control of yourself.

Rhunta • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 06:47 AM [recovered]

Luckily I dont live in America.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 02:09 PM

Not just America. That's how it works in all civilized countries. Period.

'They' is any group who has power over another group.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 08:18 AM

Me neither but it's the same in Europe. Or anywhere you live if it's not a tribe.

Yakatonker • 18 points • 19 April, 2015 04:42 AM*

I don't see the regression at all. The old system of marriage was economical because the old system despite its crushing poverty was beneficial to men and women so as there was extreme motivation on the part of women to keep others in line to be virgins and to marry so as to avoid being part of a permanent prostitution class(industrialized Britian, Ancient Rome both had large majorities of female prostitutes), ie the lowest of the lowest social castes, and still is.

What we're seeing is that feminism as a socially engineered piece is forcing women to hold their own economic weight as primary income earners, so as to hold up their share of the economic sky. Why so many men here cry about career women is ridiculous, there are so many men in redundant and unrewarding jobs but no one gives a fuck about them because of this retarded subconscious belief in the male psych to give anything with a vagina automatic economic value. Those women have choosen their own economic venue as have men, their woes are not out business nor is their happiness. Society choose to force them into egalitarian roles and they being the enforcers of that order have decided to fill in its shoes, we're not responsible for their actions.

Women and men are animals, the only difference being we have the tools to blunt our deficiencies enough and the power of consciousness to exert more out of our lives. Men a century ago would would long hours every day, there was no 9-5, no pension with benefits, there was the rich then there was the poor and there was nothing else in between. If anything this soft serve democratic socialism with globalist technocracy is the best thing since ever for men. We don't have to be slaves to gynocentrism(feminist prerogatives or social hierarchy(validation)), we can actually research, self actualize as with TRP and build a proper framework

that our shitty parents and government institutions never gave us in an effort to create a concerted and permanent under class. There is no going back, personally I look forward to the changes to come, especially if women are now going to be forced to hold up the economic pillars of society with social changes to match which give men more free time to self actualize away from shitty gynocentric institutions.

[deleted] • 8 points • 19 April, 2015 08:36 PM

Like it or not, it is a regression. Civilization, characterized by an abundance of material resources above and beyond what's necessary for survival, springs from sexual restraint and a patriarchy--the two go hand-in-hand. Subsistence-living, characterized by a minimal amount of material resources sufficient only for immediate needs, springs from sexual promiscuity and a matriarchy--the two go hand-in-hand.

I don't know about you, but I like first-world electricity, air conditioning, and abundance of food.

Women can only hold up the system for a limited time, because when they do so they stop having children. I don't think I need to explain why that's a disaster of epic proportions.

Yakatonker • -2 points • 19 April, 2015 08:49 PM*

Patriarchy servers matriarchy, we live in this crap hole of a feminist system presently with the gynocentric imperatives at the fore front of our western governments and with society at large having always placed female prerogatives at the forefront.

I don't know about you, but I like first-world electricity, air conditioning, and abundance of food.

This is so ridiculous as a theory, did you even remotely think when typing this out? Transistor technology is the great catalyst of ever increasing technological change, along with the expansion and global integration of the global economies by the world government, we now have greater synergy towards technological innovation. Also the governments of the world are operating toward population stabilization, meaning people don't need to be pumping out entire litters to maintain economic stability. Why do you think think organizations like planned parent hood have existed for nearly a century? or why our western economies are becoming white collar away from manufacturing entirely, because the global economic system is being efficient in its economics, and we the former beneficiaries of the old order and present global order profit obscene from it.

People who stop having tons of children are in no way a means to and end. Women will hold their own economic pillars and men will be for the first time given reprieve from the role as the provider.

[deleted] • 5 points • 19 April, 2015 09:53 PM

The great catalyst of technological improvement was the discovery of fossil fuels. The utilization of fossil fuels gave us unprecedented access to vast reservoirs of energy, which is what set off the Industrial Revolution (250ya). This is what lead to the advancement of mechanical technology which only recently (60ya) resulted in the development of the transistor.

"Population stabilization" is a fraud. In raw numbers, yes, the size of the population of developed countries has plateaued. When you look closer at the statistics, however, it becomes evident that there are complications: the White total fertility rate of 1.75 isn't enough to stave off population contraction (2.1), let alone population growth, and the age distribution of all developed countries is increasingly top-heavy.

DaphneDK • 3 points • 20 April, 2015 02:06 PM

What we're seeing is that feminism as a socially engineered piece is forcing women to hold their own economic weight as primary income earners, so as to hold up their share of the economic sky.

It doesn't really work that way. At least not around here. Women are still heavily dependent on men for their livelihood. It's just that the state has been pushed in as a middleman (though welfare payments) so it might seem less obvious, and certainly there's no aspect of reciprocity. As for career women. I'm all for it, if that's their thing.

Yakatonker • 1 point • 21 April, 2015 01:38 AM

Their future can already be seen now, women are entering post secondary at higher rates than males and the governments of the west are trying to subsidize and incentivize women into all fields of work even though there's some intense lag in more mathematical fields, accounting, engineering, software engineering.

The women of the boomer era are dependent on men for a primary income, the women in the millennial generation, not so much. You're also right, the government is also going to unfortunately pay for 25% of women's (single mothers) children through welfare, but it's better than a destructive criminal underclass with no means to escape or economically self-sustain themselves. The state does us a service in this manner so as the single mother CC riders don't go about creating real economic devastation.

joneyman • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 05:19 AM [recovered]

What's your idea of this "underclass"?

Yakatonker • 7 points • 19 April, 2015 05:59 AM* [recovered]

Criminal underclass, poor underclass, middle class, wealth castes, these are all systems built upon by the hierarchies of people in the overall system. The rich aren't smart per se but people who gate their economic positions with tightly knit economic groupings who filter and only absorb high yield potential from the lower castes to maintain sufficient economic turnover. Consolidation of wealth calcifies and you get the pre-Napoleonic era all over again with feudalism, monarchy, or what is modern day plutocracy, this notion of democracy is a joke fed as hope to the masses. The only way the system will be a "democracy" is with externalized economic measures and incentives which are being placed upon nations by the Bank of International Settlements SDRs which will weigh in the size and economic performance of middle classes in a nation, otherwise the plutocrats of each nation would be happy to wallow in their corruptive vice.

The underclass is seen today in society with the criminal class in the U.S. justice system incarcerates more men per capita than in any other nation. Criminals have an extremely hard time integrating and obtaining high income roles in society. They're often predisposed to a host of crippling behavioural problems and are utilized as a cheap source of labor, as well these people are disenfranchised from challenging the status quo with their lack of economic power. The systems of Europe are extremely lenient and are focused on rehabilitation rather than outright incarceration as a means to give criminals a chance of equity in society. Criminals are an easy way, poor people are also an example, people who lack the proper framework to understand the economics at play to benefit. The system is made to cripple the poor who neither have time to excel within the system that only the wealthy can, and to deprive the poor of the ability to economically self-sustain through the creation of their own equity which is taken away from them from rent-seeking elite (bankers, slum lords, anyone who utilizes debt slavery to make a living while in no way contributing to the creation of equity in society). The poor are then kept in their classes while the few managers live obscenely off their equity. CEOs don't work harder than the normal laymen, they're not intellectually superior or irreplaceable rather they exist in gated human systems which seek to consolidate wealth and social

power. A lot of this is slowly being eroded with the advances of democratic socialism, "entitlements" or the redistribution of equity back to its generators. The systems of old never had a middle class, this concept is because of the new economic reality created out of the ashes of WWII from Bretton Woods, the massive fiat system which has taken so much equity from the future and infinitely pumped it into the present to support systems that could never exist without it, ie social programs, pensions, subsidies, medicare, "entitlements", etc. For its part globalization is a god send as well as the global economic managers who're forcing this system into place. Cheaper, faster tech, mass expansion of socialist programs and a soft serving of female friendly work policies is making life overall a lot less work oriented and creating an information based society, a globalized society which is slowly intermeshing with the erosion of barriers between social classes at least in terms of communication. However despite this economic disparities are still quite steep between the classes.

Jack_Sophmore • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 10:54 PM

CEOs don't work harder then the normal laymen, they're not intellectually superior or irreplaceable rather they exist in gated human systems which seek to consolidate wealth and social power. A lot of this is slowly being eroded with the advances of democratic socialism, "entitlements" or the redistribution of equity back to its generators.

Can you give examples of how CEO's wealth or power is being eroded?

Yakatonker • 1 point • 21 April, 2015 02:05 AM*

<http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2015/02/02/255130/obama-budget-targets-offshore.html>

JC Collins has a link on his site directly(can't find atm) to this long term agenda which has been brewing in the White House for some time. Wealth transfers will start or are already in the process as a means to start boosting U.S. infrastructure in a global information economy, at least for developed nations. These incentives come as the SDR starts to displace the USD and the new composite rules for dollar parity include measures tied to middle class performance. As for CEOs, their power directly in terms of money won't be overly affected unless its siphoned through taxation which is likely to occur. Measures in Greece which chase after nationals in other countries are an eventuality in the global economy and will help to prevent the plutocratic class from displacing their wealth in the system. In terms of CEOs in other countries technology is helping in some part to blunt Chinese corruption despite the rather retaliatory nature of its conservative plutocrats, something which Xi Jinping is trying to temper but that's a work in progress if at all at the moment. With regards to CEOs they're the micro managers for the global economy, I've yet to see a specific institution or law which targets them or aims for accountability. Well less of course your into the conspiratorial and you count the assassinations of the bankers as some sort of shadowy means to bring accountability.

I highly suspect Clinton will take the next election and will push the U.S. along globalist social programming lines as is occurring in Canada and western European nations, ie feminism, redistribution through taxation(globalist liberal policies).

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 01:33 PM

Can you recommend me some literature surrounding these topics?

Yakatonker • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 02:29 PM*

My world framework comes from multiple places, I suppose a base understanding came from

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, a critic of the Napoleonic government which was an experimental groundwork in the late 1700s for the creation of rights and the more egalitarian shift in European societies. He saw the same old historical patterns of corruption and makes some great comparatives to ancient Rome in his book, [What is Property. Proudhon does call himself anarchist in his own time, though the meaning then, and the meaning now are quite obscured for political grandstanding by ill thought spinsters. In terms of a permanent criminal class given the U.S.'s massive incarceration system, its kind of easy to find information with regards to criminal employment within the U.S. or stats with regards to several factors including wealth and education amongst other indicators towards the stability of this class. Another interesting thing I've seen is the black community, or the total dissolution of it thanks to the overly hypergamous ways of it, one critic of it is Tommy Sotomayor, he's MGTOW in terms of RP philosophy and his critique is not all encompassing however its an interesting perspective into the woes of the black community.

Panda_Love_23 • 0 points • 19 April, 2015 11:57 AM*

Honest question:

I am an only child, 22 female, joining the air force for an intel job with plans to secure a high paying job after the military in the 6 figs category. I feel pressured from my parents (being their only kid) and society to find a job to support myself with, since divorce rates are so high and I could be committing career suicide by settling down (meaning if I get divorced 15 years from now, I am screwed for not having furthered my job earlier in life), etc.

I am very confused how this is going to influence my dating game. I feel like I have been forced to exit the world of monogamy/being a dutiful housewife and mother, just so I could enter the world of working my buns off to stabilize myself and be happy that I never have to rely on someone. The notion of independence sounds great, obviously, but I am one of the few traditional females out there. I love old fashioned relationships, and the idea of having a man in charge while I be a happy housewife for him, maybe working a simple part-time job to pay for extra things we need. I realize that focusing on my career while I still have no dependents will sacrifice my fleeting youth that secures men. Because, from what I have gathered from here, I will be undesirable past 25. I've only ever had two boyfriends, but I guess even that ruins my SMV.

Am I lost cause, and should just accept being single? I went to college, but the degree I got will not allow me to support myself fully without 10+ years of more schooling. Military just sounds better at that point. I hate the CC culture. I can't hoe myself out, but I have a high libido, so it creates sexual frustration when I am single. Do I have to embrace the CC culture to be with men and get some kind of relationship satisfaction, since no one will want to wife me after 25? I am just terrified that focusing on my career, something I feel obligated to do, will ruin my chances of marriage :(I'll have an amazing job, be more developed as a person, but I won't be 22 anymore. I also don't date casually. I like my LTRs. Although I don't like when they don't last...but I guess it's hard dating when you're young :P You're still growing up, after all. But it seems that's my only opportunity to find a hubby to grow old with...but I feel like if I surrender over to TRP ways fully, I will have to deal with settling for a RP man that will spin his plates while still with me (my last BF, who was alpha as hell, was doing that, and it ended the relationship), and one that will forever keep me at arm's length so I can't "manipulate" him. Even though all I want is a healthy relationship where we can talk about things/be his support system, just be loyal to each other, screw like rabbits at the same time, and eventually create little mini versions of us, and play video games at night when the kids are asleep, and then I get to get up and make breakfast for my sweet little family (my marriage fantasy, lol). *Sigh*. Is dating just a waste of time for both genders at this point? It keeps

looking like that :(I'm feeling really discouraged about dating right now.

EDIT: words.

copralalic • 15 points • 19 April, 2015 04:14 PM

since no one will want to wife me after 25?

Wow, you've been reading around here too much. Or not enough.

The sexual value of a female diminishes somewhat after the age of 18, but the rate of the decrease accelerates after about 25. That doesn't mean the morning of your 26th birthday you will be a hag that men would rather throw rocks at than look at.

You will still have the majority of your attractiveness for most of your life, especially if you take care of yourself by eating right and exercising. One of the things that makes many CC women less attractive after 25 isn't their actual looks, but the change in attitude when they notice all the younger girls in the bar getting *even more* attention than they do. The 25's still get lots of attention, even more than they necessarily want, but the 19's get *more*. This changes something in the heart of the 25 because she loses something in that moment. The 25 stares into the abyss -- and a lifetime of face creams and granny panties stares back. She becomes, for the first time in her life, a 2nd class citizen. It doesn't matter that there are such a thing as 75th class citizens; the real pain is going from #1 to #2.

I've known a woman deep into her 40's who was still physically beautiful, I would have been happy to buy her gallons of wine just to hear her laugh over dinner. She had true Charm (and a husband). Men are not so shallow that they will never wife a woman over 25, it's just that the Best kind of men want the Best kind of women, and the Best women are Joyful, not jaded.

Men say it all the time; if they had pussies, they would be on the CC in a heartbeat. That's because the CC is a *masculine* thing. Women enjoy romance, mystery, and yes, they even enjoy sex... but they don't usually enjoy promiscuity for promiscuity's sake. Fifty Shades of Gray wasn't Ana banging 50 different 50 year-olds. The CC isn't damaging to a woman's body (apart from STIs and potential impaired fertility) but to her heart. It drains her of Joy, which is the most beautiful thing a woman can share with a man. It sucks out her innocence and masculinizes her. If you can have multiple relationships that do not jade you, where you can come out on the other side a better person happier with your life and with men in general... well, go for it! But if every man who kisses you steals a bit of your hope, steals a bit of your Joy, then why would you ever want to let them kiss you?

I don't envy you, child. (I'm old enough I can call you that.) Remember not to let the perfect be the enemy of the good. You are too young to be so stressed out. There are lots of great men out there, perhaps especially in the military (I know, I was there). Divorce is largely (but not entirely) in your hands, so you can't live in fear of it. Being the only child has left you feeling the weight of your parents' expectations a bit too much, but you can prioritize your influences if you choose to.

Just be young, be happy, be in love, and if the man has good fundamentals (loyalty, ambition, work ethic, prioritization of health, desire for a family, similar religion) then he's probably a good bet. Keep his "jelly bean jar" full and you won't lose him. Men who love you enough to marry you *want* to be loyal, and if you take care of him he'll stay with you forever.

Beige Phillip: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0GkBPPxj5oo>

Panda_Love_23 • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 11:13 AM

First off - thank you so much for taking the time to reply with that response :) I really appreciated it, and it really did lift my spirits.

I feel more secure now about my fleeting youth, especially when you phrased the concept of hitting the wall at 25 in the context that you did. I have never been promiscuous or attention seeking, and while obviously everyone likes attention, I don't need it endlessly to feel happy about myself. I also don't smoke at all, drink *very* occasionally, work out, and don't tan. My mom is aging extremely well, into her 50s, but people are convinced she is in her 30s. I am also mistaken for a 19 a lot of times, sometimes 18. Hopefully I can extend my physical youth and try my best to age gracefully.

the Best women are Joyful, not jaded.

I will definitely remind myself of this often :) I'm not a fan of drama or negativity, and I've definitely attracted a lot of men based on this personality trait (obviously they were physically attracted to me, but they always commented I was "different" and more "chill/happy" than most girls) I'm for sure going to guard that part of my personality. Luckily I like to date seriously, and I hate to stew in negativity and always look for the positive in a past relationship. As long as I can maintain that, I am feeling more hopeful about dating past 25 now :)

And I loved that Beige Phillip's video. Such a simple way to put things. I already act that way in relationships (I'm a pleaser in a relationship, honestly), but it's definitely beneficial to be reminded of that every now and then, just so I don't lose touch with that way of thinking. I faved that video.

Again, thanks for the reply :)

Queef-Latinah • 10 points • 19 April, 2015 03:14 PM

You may also ask over on /r/redpillwomen too, they could be helpful

Panda_Love_23 • 0 points • 19 April, 2015 03:32 PM

Thanks for responding. And okay, I'll have to make a post over there then. I was curious about guys POV mostly, since I'm wondering what their perception of my SMV would be. But getting experience notes from other ladies is also a good idea :)

Also...dat user name.

Limekill • 7 points • 19 April, 2015 03:56 PM*

I will be undesirable past 25

Probably. Personally I don't even look at dating anyone over 23.

I will just go overseas to a 3rd world country to wife up a virgin. Infinitely easier, plus they actually have morals (well social/family constraints) and she won't get fat. And we will probably stay there.

I only despair with what is happening...

You think its bad now. For the next generation, it is my guess, marriage will simply not occur - just look at the statistics for female african-americans. And all races are following them - its a race to the bottom.

http://2.bp.blogspot.com/-UviJ9bQ_T14/USyB__r60iI/AAAAAAAAA8k/vyN6lpJvnV4/s400/BlackwomenunmarriedEcon.gif

[deleted] • -2 points • 19 April, 2015 04:54 PM

[permanently deleted]

aguy01 • 8 points • 19 April, 2015 05:23 PM

Yea, I feel bad for that guy. There's so much used up pussy that he's missing out on... Those tight young bodies will never satisfy him.

IVlaskerade • 3 points • 20 April, 2015 08:45 AM*

I was curious about guys POV

If you want to catch fish, you ask a fisherman, not a fish.

Pretty much all the advice you get here *must* be taken with a grain of salt (yes, including what I'm saying now) because ultimately, we will tell you what is best for us, not you.

Panda_Love_23 • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 11:16 AM

Ah, very true. That's a good reminder :) Thank you.

Seishuu • 5 points • 19 April, 2015 05:12 PM

Your SMV won't magically go away past 25. Matter of fact, most women hit the wall around 28-30, not 25. And the fact that you've had 2 relationships doesn't ruin your SMV at all in the real world. Sure, you'll find some people here rambling about virgins being the only good option but in reality finding a good-looking girl who's a virgin and doesn't have serious issues is next to impossible.

[deleted] • 6 points • 19 April, 2015 08:10 PM

The other responses you got weren't terrible, but they weren't very good.

The simple truth is that the longer you remain unmarried, the lower your value drops. Aging, loss of innocence (bitterness), and promiscuity are siren calls that no one can resist for long. It's not without good reason that parents in traditional societies married off their daughters (or pressured them to marry) as young as they could. Unfortunately, your parents have failed you in this respect. Fortunately, you possess the rare wherewithal to do it yourself.

Your last BF wasn't really your boyfriend. You were the modern-day equivalent of a concubine in a harem. Like it or not, the fact that your boyfriend was unwilling to become exclusive with you (or at least lie to you about it) indicates that you were looking in the wrong place. Probably, he didn't think you were enough of a catch to be willing to be exclusive with you.

Divorce is caused by the wife in probably 90% of cases. There never was much incentive for the husband to divorce, but the modern divorce system has made it so that he will almost never divorce. And if you cook and clean, raise the children, and have a gentle disposition, there's virtually no chance he'll subject you to divorce.

Put simply, you can do one or the other, but not both. You can have career, an average marriage with a loser husband (40% divorce rate because women hate him so much), and maybe be a mother, but not one that's around much to take care of her children. Or you can have no career, a good or great husband, and be a loving mother to as many children as your heart desires.

It's obvious to me which one you really want, but ultimately it's your decision. Choose wisely, and if you choose the latter, commit to it just as fully as you would commit to a job; treat your "husband search" as a full-time job, learn to charm the pants off every man you meet (not literally), treat him like a king, and raise his children faithfully. It is just as much a "career" as is the working career.

jacks1000[S] • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 11:24 PM

Just as the Washington Post article linked to explains, and what the whole concept of "concubine" means, is that when you put it all aside - women's "careers," "modern dating" and the "end of slut shaming..."

the fact is that women who can't find an appropriate husband are simply looked down upon in society. She may - or may not - have a fabulous job.

But unless she is married, with children, she's just someone's concubine.

As the Washington Post article explains, to Millennials marriage is a STATUS indicator.

What does a woman need to go from someone's piece on the side - a concubine - to a respectable member of society?

She needs a husband.

There are fewer and fewer middle class white women finding husbands.

Thus, the concubine class.

It's sort of obvious, isn't it?

[deleted] • 6 points • 20 April, 2015 02:11 AM

If it were obvious, we wouldn't have women trying to get married at 30 or older. If it were obvious, we wouldn't have a divorce system that *incentivizes* wives to divorce their husbands. If it were obvious, we wouldn't have career womyn, or fat acceptance, or slut acceptance.

It's not obvious. We may like to think that everyone has an equal chance of figuring "it" out, but the reality is that people aren't equal, and neither is their mental horsepower. A select few have the capacity to come to these conclusions on their own, a small minority have the capacity to acknowledge the truth of these conclusions if exposed to them, and the greater majority wouldn't know what's what if it fell out of the sky and smacked them in the face.

Maybe that's a bit harsh, but it's the truth. You need to realize just how privileged we really are to even be having this conversation.

jacks1000[S] • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 02:34 AM

Are you telling me to check my privilege? :)

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 April, 2015 02:54 AM

I'm telling you to be aware of it. And now you've made me realize that I have to be aware how I use the previously perfectly innocuous word "privilege" because its meaning has been warped by liberal/progressive/feminist shitheads.

Panda_Love_23 • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 12:55 PM*

thanks for the reply :) I appreciate the honesty.

I am very much a natural subservient, doting partner, so I think that's why I naturally feel the desire to take advantage of my youth while I still have it. I don't desire to just basically find a sperm donor who will pay for things, but a true companion I can grow old with and have fun creating mini versions of us with. So like you said, I can definitely treat it as a job, as I take making my man happy very seriously. I get a very strong sense of accomplishment knowing I make his life better, not worse. So I guess a part of treating it like a job is to recognize my resume is in its prime right now.

I think that's why I was trying to make my last BF work once I found the plates. He is just so

naturally alpha that it's literally in his system to do that. When I told him I couldn't be with someone who can't commit fully (something I do feel entitled to since I give my entire being into whatever relationship I'm in), he was not happy. He tried to rationalize it with me, saying he could commit solely to me in a marriage context, save for the commitment of his body. It took a lot of willpower, but I had to decline his offer. I saw a true sense of real remorse and loss when I left, but I think being a womanizer is a facet of his personality much deeper than just sexual. And he was 34, meaning it would be unlikely to change in him. Anyway, aside from my rambling, I think you are right though about looking in the wrong place. I think he was...maybe too alpha? Or too much into bachelor life? I don't know, he seems to regret losing me, but at the same time, I feel like a man could be exclusive if he really wanted to.

I've already attracted another man who seems to fit my bill thus far since I switched gyms - ex BF and I went to the same one - so maybe I should give in to my instinct to be a loving partner. I do think you bring up a good point that divorce will be mostly unlikely if I select a good man and make him a top priority at all times. I guess I have just seen so many ships crash and burn it makes you want to secure your own butt first. But then again, those people might have had issues I never knew about. I'll definitely have to re-consider my priorities on what I really want.

either way, thanks again for the honest comment :) It definitely help re-orient myself.

jacks1000[S] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 02:44 PM

I am very much a natural subservient, doting partner, so I think that's why I naturally feel the desire to take advantage of my youth while I still have it.

Believe me, with an attitude like that, there are plenty of men that would "wife you up."

What you need to do is hop off of the "cock carousel" now and don't put out for any more natural "alphas."

Tell men straight up you want a ring - marriage. You will be surprised, plenty of men aren't interested in promiscuity.

MyReddit4 • 8 points • 19 April, 2015 05:04 PM

"Be happy that I never have to rely on someone"

Why would a girl ever think she'd be happy *not* relying on a man?

That's kinda the point of having a vagina. For eons of history and countless species, female submission was imperative to survival. The whole "I don't need no man" trope is just made up bs for the fat chics who are the girl version of the Cheeto-stained basement dweller.

Panda_Love_23 • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 11:19 AM

I think what I was trying to get at is I want to find my own happiness separate from him, so I am not putting the pressure of my happiness on his shoulders. Because I can't be an optimal partner if he is my happiness. Because then that would mean if he was having a bad day, my day would subsequently turn bad as well. And then I've ruined myself as a good support system.

I do need a man to satisfy my desire for companionship, but I don't want to need him so desperately that I lose my own identity. I want to be as happy and interesting on my own as possible, so I can compliment his life, versus siphon his happiness to fill my own void,

EpicLevelCheater[M] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 04:56 PM

This subreddit is for the discussion of sexual strategy for men.

Take this question to /r/RedPillWomen. The women there will be better-equipped to help you.

CptDefB • 0 points • 19 April, 2015 05:05 PM

About that SMV... google Chickentuna, you now have a new role model.

[deleted] • -1 points • 19 April, 2015 04:51 PM

[permanently deleted]

SILENTSAM69 • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 06:34 PM

It is not a return. It is the norm and always has been.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 08:21 PM

Nope. Sexual restraint varies a lot over time. As recently as 60 years ago, 90-95% of brides were virgins at time of marriage. Today, it's 2-3%. Does the former sound like an environment conducive to today's existence of harems for a few men and nothing for the rest?

SILENTSAM69 • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 02:05 AM

I wonder about those stats in a way. I have heard in societies that value virgins on wedding nights unmarried girls are often into anal. I heard this mainly about Italy, but it makes me wonder about other societies like that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 02:38 AM

If you can imagine it happening, it's probably happened. And yet, the distance between anal and regular intercourse is so minuscule that it's hard for me to imagine teenagers engaging in one without the other. I think the claim that anal intercourse is a regular practice for sexually restrained young girls in patriarchal societies smells fishy. I think it smells like feminist propaganda promulgated in order to make unchecked promiscuity seem in line with historical norms.

SILENTSAM69 • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 02:46 AM

The source was not feminists. I would not have listened to it then. It was from an Italian construction worker.

There are tricks women learn to appear virgin. Like saving some blood from preparing food to squirt in the sheet.

[deleted] • 0 points • 20 April, 2015 02:51 AM

It doesn't have to be from a feminist to be a feminist idea. Feminists are just a useful scapegoat for liberal ideas. Anyway, all I know is that fraud has always existed but the anal bit as a regular practice seems fishy.

NeoreactionSafe • 27 points • 19 April, 2015 02:28 AM*

This is a "Fertility Negative" take on things. (the post)

In order to maintain a 2.13 fertility rate (now it's about 1.8) it will be necessary to have more women actually have children, not just fucking for recreation.

Fucking for recreation is just that... **Recreation.** (it's not to be taken seriously)

Unless you are willing to let the **Demographic Winter** take over all this goofing around won't produce enough children. It also gets "turbocharged" because too many old people and young people living off welfare / disability / not working means taxes go too high. The few children get saddled with too much taxation and choose to work less. They produce even fewer children.

www.youtube.com/watch?v=L8XQjfG2wYc

www.youtube.com/watch?v=tw3OQgFsHZI

I love the dreamy concept... 10% of Alpha males rule the world, but in reality you need the middle of your civilization to participate or it dies. The King that kills off his own people is left with no defenders.

Unless the middle can be restored the Muslims and other patriarchies will rule the earth.

jacks1000[S] • 21 points • 19 April, 2015 02:46 AM

No, I hear you. This is not a celebration of slutting it up with prole girls.

Classes that lose power often have a demographic winter and often lose a lot of population.

Unless the middle can be restored the Muslims and other patriarchies will rule the earth.

Yes.

[deleted] • 8 points • 19 April, 2015 10:52 AM

I love the dreamy concept... 10% of Alpha males rule the world, but in reality you need the middle of your civilization to participate or it dies.

The middle has always participated and contributed with manual labor and war fighting, and more recently, paper pushing and such. However, due to technological advances, these tasks have become increasingly automated since the industrial revolution, a process that's accelerating rapidly in the 21st century. Today, most employment in America is only necessary in that it keeps people busy and out of mischief. Relevant: David Graeber: The Modern Phenomenon of Nonsense Jobs

Ultimately, the forces at work reshaping our civilization are just as unstoppable as the previous industrial revolutions. It's your choice whether to spend your limited time on earth worrying instead of living.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 11:33 AM

this makes the US and EU essentially inherently socialistic? in the sense that most of the money is generated in a small sector and then re-distributed not by welfare but by giant government-funded institutions that "hire" people?

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 April, 2015 12:07 PM

As I see it, what the system has become is essentially a clever way to achieve the following simultaneously:

1. Socialisically (but not equally, because then it would be too obviously socialistic) distribute resources to the masses (because starving citizens cause trouble)
2. Make them feel like useful, needed contributors who *earned* their keep (so that they feel patriotic, secure and important)
3. Keep them busy (and thus ignorant and controllable, as people with spare time tend to educate themselves)

Of course, the degree to which this applies to any individual is on a sliding scale; some people do more objectively important work than others, and some are more clued in than others about the workings of our society. There are people in every stratum of society who improve civilization, and who hurt it.

Another key benefit of point 2 is that the middle class faux-contributors, having been tricked into believing themselves more important to civilization than the lower class, can be easily be led to view the lower class as contemptible parasites. This redirects their hatred from where it would otherwise go: toward those who sit around delegating and yet reap great riches, e.g. bankers. Classic divide and conquer.

draketton • 11 points • 19 April, 2015 03:55 AM

Bring on the demographic winter, I say. It's the natural consequence of an economy based baby boom.

In the decade following world war 2 the US had an overwhelmingly strong economy relative to the rest of the world, due to its competitors killing each other's men and destroying each other's infrastructure. Those days are long gone. You can't expect people to reproduce like they still have 1950 level of disposable income, not without far worse consequences than a "demographic winter".

2 things to keep in mind:

The impact of a demographic winter can be softened by growing infrastructure, growing automation in dangerous but necessary trade jobs, and the generation who grew up during the good times paying it back by retiring later than most generations do. This is what we're seeing in the US.

Because other countries have done such a good job of catching up to the US in the past 65 years, the US is a lot more expendable than it used to be. Even if the nation does fall apart, it's not the end of western civilization.

ChairBorneMGTOw • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 02:27 AM

I think you're underestimating the importance of the US to Western Civ. Europe is fucked both economically and demographically. Australia and New Zealand are too small in population to be the guardian of Western civ. Latin America and Eastern Europe have never embraced the protestant work ethic (being catholic and orthodox).

If you have a survival strategy for a post-US world, good for you. But operate under no illusion, a western demographic winter will involve a lot of violence, disease, starvation, and potentially war.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 12:52 PM

I am hearing online and IRL from co-workers that New Zealand is the place to be right now. Good economy and good quality of life. Sure it's not big enough to be a military powerhouse and be "safe" in that aspect, but isn't that the purpose of having allies?

ChairBorneMGTOw • 1 point • 21 April, 2015 04:54 AM

Then I'd suggest ya get there and establish yourself before the hordes of human locusts descend on the last viable place in the world to be a free human and destroy it. For me? I love NZ. But at my age (40s) I think the descent of the West will be timed about similarly to my lifespan. But younger men need a plan. Seriously.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 11:28 AM

Another important factor is bring down the cost and jobs required to take care of the old generation. A lot

of the care can be automated or upscaled. Of course people complain old people get too little 1-on-1 interaction with nurses etc, but it's still better than just letting them starve.

99639 • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 04:51 AM

That is not a problem anyone alive today will face until the very end of our lives, if we ever have to face it at all. Unless you believe you are personally capable of shifting the culture of the Western world in a few short years, this is really none of your concern. A thought exercise to muse over if you're bored but nothing more.

jonewman • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 05:13 AM [recovered]

You don't think we live in faster times? You would think information and technology speed up the process?

drunkandstoned • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 06:08 AM [recovered]

It operates on a generational scale, information and technology doesn't change the length of a generation (much). That said, once we have robots that can replace 80IQ workers with relatively cheap upkeep costs all bets are off, but who cares about fertility then.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 11:19 AM

The demographic winter is a logical consequence of the baby boom. You can't just create a ton of people, and then create an even bigger amount to take care of the former generation. Every couple generations you need kind of a reset, otherwise you'll put the planet's resources to exhaustion and have young+old die.

It's the same thing that caused the current economic crisis: very simplified (there are a ton of good documentaries on this subject), consumers/governments/banks collectively got into a circle of dept for consumption and pay off the dept with the profit of the consumption. So the consumption had to be ever larger, and the dept be ever deeper. And when the dept could not be paid the whole thing collapsed.

meet_me_at_high_noon • 0 points • 19 April, 2015 12:54 PM

You do know not all Muslims want the same thing right?

NeoreactionSafe • 9 points • 19 April, 2015 01:08 PM*

If the stronger ones take over will it matter what the weaker ones believe?

In Russia does anyone care that liberal marxist types are assassinated? (No)

Nature abhors a vacuum (the lack of clear natural hierarchy) and seeks to correct itself.

Even in chaotic cultures like in Africa the Alpha criminality pushes out weaker forces.

The biggest mistake that Marxism makes is in thinking that you can scramble the brains of it's participants and not expect it will fall apart eventually. Red Pill is about waking up to natural hierarchy... it's refilling the vacuum that the West has created for itself. It's restoring Truth when Lies now dominate.

meet_me_at_high_noon • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 01:13 PM

Fair point sir! Nothing to argue here.

ChadThundercockII • -4 points • 19 April, 2015 12:32 PM

Unless the middle can be restored the Muslims and other patriarchies will rule the earth.

Probably not. Can't you see that America is destroying Muslim countries on a daily basis? The only ones left

are the ones in North Africa, haa, and those have naturalized Western culture. So the world is pretty fucked up all over the place.

feltbluesawred • 7 points • 19 April, 2015 02:28 AM

I like the part about going to a small town. I've always thought that even as a moderately successful/capable man you could go to a small town, fuck your way through the phonebook, then take off.

Ovadox • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 11:20 AM

I grew up in a small town in upstate NY. I live close enough that I still go back on occasion. There are a few good looking girls around but after HS graduation most of the ones with any real prospects leave. The ones that stay seem to be intent on the goal of having as many bastard children as possible while shooting to develop type II diabetes before they hit 40.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 11:38 AM

how would you go about that? you don't know anyone, have no business there etc.

chuckthundercock • 18 points • 19 April, 2015 08:19 AM

I'm in early 40's, I have power and resources, married with kids, and swap between two girls. 22 and 23. One is a 10 with an attractive college boyfriend she "loves" who is of equal age. The other is a massage therapist. They compete for my attention completely on the downlow. My alpha friends share similar stories. Yes, it's happening, and I love it. I look at my young brothers as posters here and think, you'll one day have your day, but it isn't in your 20s.

ChadThundercockII • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 12:33 PM

The good thing is that you have kids. Teach them have to be men/women. Your job on this planet will be over then.

watersign • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 04:33 AM

the concubine class is quite large today due to the fact there aren't many good jobs.

unseen1unknown • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 10:39 AM

It's an interesting idea this concubine class, where only the girls who are 10s 'may' rise above and get married to the rich alpha of their dreams. The rest will try their luck with sports stars, celebrities etc and some will just go for DT men who are into drug dealing etc.

But at some point they all come to the wall or near it, have the epiphany phase like what was described in Preventive medicine by Rollo. Then the prole men and former middle class can have the left over concubines....

It's going to be interesting if there is an economic collapse and the bottom 80% realise how screwed they are. I wonder where their rage will turn?

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 11:42 AM

There will be no rage, because they don't realize/acknowledge how they are getting fucked in the ass by society. Because it's society that determines what is acceptable and what not. Most people here once believed that the only way to happiness was to be trained in a BB provider and wait for when the pool of late 20's women throws you a bone.

Venicedreaming • 0 points • 20 April, 2015 05:57 AM

Not that you should be rooting for any kind of social collapse. No matter how rich you are, an armed mob is going to be a headache

[deleted] • 1 points • 20 April, 2015 06:21 PM

[permanently deleted]

Venicedreaming • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 07:33 PM

It's such a step back for humanity though. Say what you will, the stone ages suck

iambecomedownvote • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 01:17 PM

Hm. Don't know about "prole girls". When I was single, I did have a good job and a nice car in the "big city" and a good friend who lived far away in a podunk town. And when I went to visit, the girls were *definitely* attracted to that. But... suddenly they all became "born again virgins", waiting for marriage (starting now) for the "right guy".

Overkillengine • 4 points • 20 April, 2015 01:13 AM

They had you pegged as a provider, not a lover.

They make providers jump through hoops like a good little monkey should.

lucidsleeper[] • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 07:45 AM

Human society is slowing reverting to the way it was before modernisation.

RealRational • 4 points • 19 April, 2015 02:08 AM*

Reddit doesn't use HTML formatting, it uses the "Markdown" syntax. To make font bold put two asterisks in front of and behind the sentence with no spaces. **Like this**. Without activating: **** Like this **** I recommend installing RES, /r/Enhancement to get the download and updates. It puts in formatting help and provides a link to the full Markdown syntax. Which is here.

Now that's out of the way, I really enjoyed reading your post. Though your syntax errors make me think you're pretty new here. So it's always a good idea to go through the sidebar, at least skim everything. Read the things you aren't familiar with fully. Read the glossary of terms.

What does "prole women" mean?

The male peers of these girls are simply not going to be economically able to be fathers, so the girls that otherwise would have married these men are going to go to college and start "careers."

Your conclusion is sound but the cause you identified is incorrect. Girls today have no desire to find men to be fathers at all, not until they hit the "wall". Tends to happen around 30. So it doesn't matter if guys their age are economically sound or not. Then, because women do love power, they also tend to go for older guys anyway. Guys their own age don't become desirable until the wall.

edit: If you have sauce on that Japanese Brothels thing I'd love to read it.

Completely agree with your take on history, rhyming not repeating and certainly not being linear.

jacks1000[S] • 8 points • 19 April, 2015 02:13 AM

Thank you.

"Prole" as in proletariat, as in working class. You know, the chick at Starbucks whose dad was an auto mechanic.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 01:05 PM

Not trying to get technical and nit-picky here or go off on a tangent.. But that working class girl's dad is making just as much as the white-collar worker who's a personal assistant to a CEO if he's running his own business and doing it right.

I know a few tradesmen who make 80k to 6 figures doing what they do. Sure it's working class labor, but TBH, I'd rather be able to wear a shirt and jeans and tell a co-worker to "go fuck himself" and pat him on the back joking around without worrying about some little blue-pill HR bitch ratting me out to the boss.

jacks1000[S] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 02:06 PM

@crimson-hound

working class girl's dad is making just as much as the white-collar worker

Fair enough, I did not mean to denigrate skilled blue collar labor.

I remember contractors in NYC during the housing boom making a few million a year.

Have you hired a plumber lately? They bill as much per hour as lawyers - and they are clearly more important too.

unassumingusername7 • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 02:12 AM

Probably proletariat shortened. Working class girl.

razor5151 • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 01:51 PM

What does "prole women" mean?

In case you haven't read 1984 by George Orwell, you should do it ASAP.

Proles=the proletariat. The working class.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 02:37 AM

Thanks (bold enhancement)

thedude122487 • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 05:22 PM

Great point. It's not a coincidence that the same white collar upper class is using the government as a tool to steal wealth from the middle class and destroy it all together. The '08 recession was just the culmination of decades of this practice collapsing like a set of dominoes.

User-31f64a4e • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 06:07 PM

This may be true, but it's risky.

Acting this way - regardless of how Alpha and powerful you are - opens you up to false rape accusations. Tread with caution and get some sort of proof of consent. (Make a little game of texting her while she lies next to you, or something.)

VegasHostTre • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 12:00 AM

Prole girls is a whole new term for it but I try to tell my homeboys all the time, instead of vacationing in Los Angeles or San Diego and striking out constantly, lets vacation somewhere like Barstow, where they're are hot California women that an amateur with a speck of power in Vegas can seduce.

Luckyluke23 • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 07:29 AM

great post man, it really puts into prospective WHY you should become a high class male (you know, do what everyone is telling you to do, get a good job, get in the gym look good have hobbies, you know the drill) once you sort out most of your problems (i'm talking about the ones you have now, Life is full of problems is how you solve them is what matters) you will become the chooser. not the choosie.

[deleted] • -1 points • 19 April, 2015 02:06 AM

This has been one interesting read, and very informative. Historically, those in high rank (everything from kings and emperors, to knights and feudal lords) had their own concubines. I've read that in the middle ages, the ruler of the province had sex with bride-to-be's before they were married off. It was a known tradition, as you had to have the feudal lord's consent to wed. Or to do anything really.

johncfremont • 11 points • 19 April, 2015 06:29 AM

The "first night" or droit du seigneur wasn't a real thing in medieval Europe, it was basically made up in the 18th century to demonize the Ancien Regime.

That's not to say it never happened, as it apparently did in colonial South America and Africa (although plenty of regular rape also happened, so not much difference) on at least a few occasions, but it's about as historical as the droit de prelasement, which stated that a lord had the right to disembowel a serf and use his entrails as a foot warmer. Take that as you will.

IllimitableMan • 6 points • 19 April, 2015 02:18 AM

It also means he gets her prized virginity, and not you. If he bust inside, you're raising a lord's bastard. Fucked up, but that's humanity for you.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 03:29 AM

Yeah, the caveat though is it wouldn't have mattered if you had Alpha mentality or not. The high rank position guaranteed your fair share of the pie. Pun.

RealRational • 9 points • 19 April, 2015 02:19 AM

Isn't that in Braveheart? I'm pretty sure that's in Braveheart.

vandaalen • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 04:33 AM

Droit du seigneur or Jus Primae Noctis. It was the right of those in power to have the first night with the bride or demand compensation for it.

real-boethius • 7 points • 19 April, 2015 09:13 AM

Droit du seigneur

"There is no evidence of the alleged right in medieval Europe."

Be aware of feminist myth-making. See also "rule of thumb" the supposed right of husbands to beat their wives with a not-too-thick stick.

bsutansalt • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 02:55 AM

It's from history. Nocte something.

tabularaja • 2 points • 19 April, 2015 04:24 AM

prima nocta "the first night"

triceratraps • 1 point • 19 April, 2015 03:37 AM

prima nocte, its in braveheart

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 April, 2015 03:29 AM

Like I said, it was a known tradition supposedly.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 April, 2015 07:00 AM

Institutionalized cucking. Gotta love it.

triceratraps • -3 points • 19 April, 2015 03:56 AM

Is this guy also a white supremacist lol?

garlicextract • 5 points • 19 April, 2015 06:15 AM

yeah he's very white biased, but I suppose his name is HipsterRacist so we shouldn't be surprised.

UlyssesElias • 0 points • 20 April, 2015 01:57 AM*

I don't understand this post at all. But it is a bit weird that you start off kinda imply that wearing a bikini on a public beach is somehow a drop in social or cultural standards for a girl or woman. Huh?

What should a woman wear on a beach? A burka?

Redpillc0re • 0 points • 19 April, 2015 11:25 AM

I believe we will see this in grand scale in the west in the next 2 decades. But i dont really believe in circularity of history, i m pessimistic that we may return to more tight knit societies. The trend of individualism has shown zero signs that it will ever stop. Gay marriage marks the endgame for nuclear family: you will soon see gays largely opting out of marriage (gays can afford to be more rational and quicker in their choices), followed by straight couples . At the least, the laws will stop bending backwards for women, at which point marriage becomes a lot more expensive contract for women.

razor5151 • -1 points • 20 April, 2015 02:02 PM

I remember when the stories emerged out of Iraq. One of the military contractors had set up a system. Blowjob from local Iraqi girls: one dollar. Girls from teenager to 20 somethings. It was a scandal because it even involved some officers.

You got a source for this, my man?

jacks1000[S] • 2 points • 20 April, 2015 02:09 PM

Nope, and I'm not going to bother doing an internet search, either. It was in the news. Google it for yourself.

I suppose every other military in the entire history of the world sets up a sex trade to service the conquering soldiers ... except the US in Iraq?

Come on.

lonernot • -2 points • 19 April, 2015 11:47 PM*

It gets even more interesting when you add race into the mix.

I have tried to refrain from asking questions about this on TRP for the most part but I have so wanted to know the answer to this. Currently, I am in a reverse situation of the writer. I am an Indian guy (no accent or anything) and I do have a thing for white girls in the USA, guess it's because they're different and I couldn't get them growing up (due to being so blue pill'd). I've pulled hot girls of my own race and even other minority groups but not so much with white girls. Occasionally when I am out I see the pretty blonde with yoga pants types and tbh, that is my type right now. What I want to know is, how much of looks, money, and status (the bare minimum) would a guy like me need to pull girls like that?

If it helps, I am in the northeast corner of USA (the midatlantic, not new england) so maybe someone from there could PM me a few pointers. Indian/Brown guys do awful here, not sure how it is like in other areas of the country. I've noticed that after doing enough approaches for a while, some white girls are opening up to me and becoming more receptive but they're hardly the type I want (which are the ones I mentioned earlier).

UlyssesElias • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 02:12 AM

I am an ethnic minority. In my group of friends, it is only the guys who have studied PhDs (two of my friends have) who have wives and girlfriends who are Anglo-Australian and of the Middle Eastern women I'm friends with/related to, the three who date anglo-Australian guys are a physiotherapist, a lawyer and a PhD student.

From my own experience, it's the professions and the field of higher education where people marry and date outside of their own culture.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 02:47 AM

Money and status always help, never hurt.

I'm a minority in the midwest and here's what works around here: use the positive stereotypes of your culture to your advantage. Be awesome but in addition be sure to be awesome at your particular background because you'll never be as good of a white guy as a white guy will.

Bring something interesting to "Here's how I'm awesome" table and that seems to lead to good returns for me.

lonernot • 1 point • 20 April, 2015 02:54 AM

What if you were practically raised white but just happen to look ethnic? That's my issue, I was raised American but I look brown. I have no accent or anything but my ethnic appearance is clearly Indian. Not sure how things work in the midwest but the northeast in general is a pretty rough area of the USA for game.