

Trees.

June 24, 2015 | 202 upvotes | by [Whisper](#)

“A society grows great when old men plant trees in whose shade they know they shall never sit.”

This is what morals are. The planting of trees for others. Now, we can argue all day about whether we "should" or "don't have to" do this. But "should" is just a one-word synonym for "I want".

The benefit of shade trees planted by the previous generation (or just other people) for us is obvious. We get to sit in the shade. But why do people do this?

Old men plant shade trees for the future, because the past planted shade trees for them. Those who receive, are willing to give back to the system they received from, because they buy into it, believe in it.

[Trust and cooperation go together.](#)

What this means is that **morals are a contract**. We hold up our end of the bargain, and others hold up theirs. But there are many different contracts, and many different people to have contracts with.

Whenever we are faced with a moral question, we cannot simply ask "*What is right?*", as if morals were a single, universal absolute. We must ask "*What is the contract?*", "*Who is it with?*", and, most importantly "*Have they kept their end of the bargain?*".

This is how to consider a moral question, from an awakened, eyes-open, red pill perspective. Is is to see moral systems from the outside, as a piece of social technology, and to evaluate them by their results, not to cling to them because they've been repeated to us over and over.

Let us suppose you are faced with the moral question of whether to fuck another man's wife. Now you could say "This is wrong, because it harms the man", or "This is not wrong, because the girl is free to do as she likes with her vagina". But both of those fail to consider the question properly. They simply repeat the principle they think is most important, without any evidence of *why* it is important, or what is the reason that people might wish to honour it.

That's not *thinking*. That's just obeying whoever was most successful in chanting slogans at you. The red pill means looking with your own eyes, and thinking with your own brain.

Instead, look at the morals, the **contract**, from the outside. What is the agreement, who is it between, are both ends being upheld?

For our example:

- Marriage is an agreement of monogamy (usually). Who is it between? The man and his wife. *Are you responsible for upholding a contract you are not part of?*
- Is there as an agreement between you and society, or all other men, not to fuck each others' wives? Maybe. But has it been upheld? *Well, what has society done to protect you from cuckoldry? It has given wives cash and prizes for engaging in it and divorcing their husbands.*
- Is there an agreement between you and the other man, as a person? Maybe. Would he fuck your wife? Who is he to you? Your brother? Your friend? An acquaintance? A stranger?

Obviously, I have some thoughts on these questions. I will not hide them. But the important thing for you is not what I think, it's to think about it for yourself.

When someone tells you to plant trees for others, ask yourself... do I sit in the shade of trees planted for me? How you answer that question is up to you. But don't let people control you with guilt and a lecture. And if you find yourself the sons of men who sat in the shade and planted no trees, I recommend

you not stand out in the sun with a shovel.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Elodrian • 16 points • 24 June, 2015 12:58 PM

And if you find yourself the sons of men who sat in the shade and planted no trees, I recommend you not stand out in the sun with a shovel.

Baby boomers: the generation that breached the social contract. Took all the benefits that our grand-parents fought and built for and instead of carrying on the grand project, sold the nation for a handful of magic beans.

Care to explain what you mean by your last sentence? I interpret it as saying "If your predecessors didn't pay it forward, you shouldn't either".

Dethklokk • 6 points • 24 June, 2015 06:28 PM

I think he means that at the very least, by reading this post and therefore being part of this community, you aren't like the other blind people who can't find shade for themselves after they were left without any shade.

Whether, you pay it forward is up to you. The major point of this post was to get you to think for yourself. If you decide that you are going to pay it forward, get yourself out of the sun first.

[deleted] • 118 points • 24 June, 2015 11:30 AM*

"I must study politics and war that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy. My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history, naval architecture, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry, and porcelain." - John Adams

Thank goodness Adams didn't throw up his arms in defeat and say "fuck fighting this war I'll never see the fruits of. I can't have the pleasure of poetry and music right now, so fuck all those guys in the future. I want mine."

I ask this to the OP in the context of trees being planted: where did the first shade trees come from?

From men who did not have the pleasure of trees of their own, but who planted some for the future anyways in order to build that society they knew they could never enjoy themselves.

The OP seems to be avoiding just coming out and saying his point plainly, so I will admit I may be reading this wrong, but it *seems* that his ultimate premise is thus: You do not have to act morally as there is no guarantee anyone will act morally to you. You are free to fuck other men's wives as you have no guarantee it won't happen to you. If all morality is simply a social contract, and you have no concrete proof you will receive any rewards of that contract personally and in your lifetime, then there is no reason for you to abide by it at all in the first place.

If that is your view, than you are a destroyer of society, just as complicit as the worst feminist. That is your right of course, and your choice. But at least come out and say it plainly. Don't try to dress up your nihilistic and destructive goals as some form so faux-zen enlightenment.

Again, you are free to bask in the fruits of what others built and spout nihilism and hedonism to your heart's content. Just make sure you take a break every once and while to thank your lucky stars that the men who built what you enjoy didn't feel as you do, even if you only admit it quietly to yourself.

CopperFox3c • 33 points • 24 June, 2015 01:18 PM

I can see both sides of the argument, but I think the OP's point is better understood from a figurative perspective. Think of it this way - the "first" men didn't plant trees, perhaps they planted some shrubs or small bushes. They didn't provide much shade, but they provided a little, and they did so quickly. They

passed down those shrubs to their progeny, who built upon them, adding some fruit trees or what not. Generations later, men were planting towering oaks.

The point is that each generation builds on the work of the last, and in doing so we build up not just a physical world, but also a social contract. We take what we are given, improve upon it, and pass it down. We cooperate with other people in our generation to accomplish this.

But if the social contract is broken (as feminists and SJWs have spent the last half century doing), then does it truly make sense to keep behaving the same way? Does it make sense to keep planting trees just to have them continuously cut down as saplings?

I believe u/Whisper/ 's point is that once the social contract is broken, it is incumbent upon us to recognize this, and adapt.

IllimitableMan • 48 points • 24 June, 2015 02:20 PM*

and in doing so we build up not just a physical world, but also a social contract.

We were left with a tattered social contract and we continue to rip it up piece by piece. The decline is mostly social as technologically and economically (not accounting for debt but just raw GDP) we're stronger than ever.

Globalisation doesn't really help as humans are tribal animals and prefer people that look and sound like them (known as ingroup preference which psychopaths take to it's absolute state: hyperindividualism.) Communities used to be tight everywhere, as per tribalism. Globalisation makes your neighbour a stranger and segregates the population. This takes society from a high trust "I know everybody around here" state to a low trust "who the fuck is that over there?" state. As trust is lower, Machiavellianism outside the political class increases and even becomes a way of life. If you want to see a microcosm of this, compare rural life to city life. People are much nicer in rural locales because they're higher trust micro societies. They have a sense of geography-based tribalism.

Then feminism emancipates women from men, the women are choosing who they mate with instead of the woman's father, and so women have sex with "bad boys" (more likely to have psychopathic genes) and breed baby psychopaths because psychopaths activate attraction switches in women. If you read the statistics, out of all the psychopaths in prison most came from single mother families and have a madonna-whore complex ala Freud (which is why such people would also find TRP agreeable.)

The decline leaves us in a state of entropy until we reach collapse, rampant opportunism and psychopathic morality (self-focussed utilitarianism) prevails. Civilizational morality aka the social contract/altruism is declining as the future of civilization looks uncertain.

The only way to reason with people who don't care about the big picture is to make them see themselves as part of it. Someone who doesn't care about anyone except themselves (a psychopath or a narcissist) doesn't even care about their own kids, let alone civilisation. Simply, the child is an extension of such a person's ego, so they care about the child - but not for the sake of the child - but for the sake of themselves. The child is a tool to be used for resolving any personal issues they have with their parents vicariously via a parental role with their child. Effectively, such people (psychopaths) don't want children for the sake of children, and don't even feel altruism for their children, they simply see their children as a means to an end - it's all ego and self-interested utilitarianism.

So as you can see - it makes sense why such people wouldn't give a shit about the big picture and will effectively perpetuate hyperindividualism on the micro and anarchism on the macro via the relative anonymity of the internet.

The only way you could remotely sell a psychopath on why unfettered utilitarianism is bad is to tell him

that his children won't be able to represent his legacy if society collapses because he will be forgotten. And even then he will try to deduce a way to leave a legacy without needing children to do so, he'll say something about leaving university papers or something. So then you need to hit him with the genetics angle and tap into the ego, talk about how his brilliance will be lost to humanity if not imbued into his children. And he might buy that, he may have kids, but they are more likely to be hyper-individualist due to his narcissism (if not his genes) than value civilisation over the self. So in a way, he's probably doing us all a favour if he doesn't reproduce. Effectively, a psychopath is a psychopath, they DGAF at the deepest of levels and no argument is going to change that.

What you have to learn about amoral utilitarian self-interested psychopathic morality is it has absolutely no altruism. Zero. Anything that looks like altruism is merely aesthetic in nature and probably a gambit to be used for leverage/to boost one's reputation. They don't help people for the sake of helping people, they help you only if they think it will benefit them in some way. Luckily psychopaths are only 1-2% of the population but their outlook (as agreed with by subclinicals) is essentially overrepresented on this sub. I probably haven't helped with that with my writings.

This sub and its views as dictated are a reactionary microcosm to the failings/vitiation of the social contract. Official position? Rip it up more because it's fucked anyway. Get yours, fuck everyone else. Essentially, even though I do not believe Roosh's position was particularly noble, there was some half-truth in what he was saying. By not giving a shit about society and being purely focused on the individual, you simply throw petrol on the decline for some short-term happiness. Better that you speed up the decline and be happy whilst it hurtles towards entropy than slow or even reverse the decline if it affects your personal happiness, right? **Enjoy the decline!**

If all of the western world followed TRP tomorrow the whole house of cards would collapse - and nobody would give a shit until it affects their ability to satiate their personal greed. When it does, in line with utilitarianism, all of a sudden they'd care. The same people who were on board with the decline will not be the same people fit to rebuild civilisation to the height that it reached. Because we didn't get this far "enjoying a decline." Once such people have harems and gold, that's them - fuck everyone. Civilisation doesn't survive without altruism, national identity and community. It cannot have these things when everybody considers themselves to be their own country. Narcissism reaching critical mass is bad for everyone in the long run.

It is what it is. I'm of the opinion the decline is not reversible and short-term incentives will continue to conquer principles designed to assure long-term incentives (eg: your kid or grandkid gets a tree) - fuck, your grandkid will be lucky to have a stick let alone a tree. Is gen Y much better than the baby boomers? Nah, they're just a poorer version of them.

It is what it is. Without collective action, one is powerless to change these things, so enjoying the decline actually makes a lot of sense. And thus we come full circle.

In light of that, I tire of all this morality talk. It's just one big loop of bullshit.

sporkbox-2 points 24 June, 2015 08:31 PM* **[recovered]**

There's a lot of talk about a "social contract" in this thread, but what exactly is it?

Also, what's wrong with someone choosing who they mate or date? Do you honestly think women should be given away by their fathers?

I'm not sure what to make of the rest of it. Society will fall because... why? There are some selfish people?

What good is "national identity"? That leads to nationalism, which leads to war. Not a good idea. Personally I have no reason to be proud of the country I live in. It's not done a whole lot for me, and

I'm embarrassed to consider myself part of the country since I don't align with much of the "values" that are touted here. What it has done, I paid for in taxes, so it's strictly business. I wouldn't fight or die for this country; if shit got bad enough, I'd just move. A government willing to sacrifice its people for its shady, selfish goals is an enemy of the public, and I've not seen any evidence to suggest that my government gives two fucks about me as a member of said public.

Altruism doesn't exist. You could give someone your last possession, spend money to help them get on their feet, get them medically well, help them get a job, whatever, and you'd still get something out of it. Pride, bragging rights, a sense of virtuosity. All of that serves the very same ego that you derided in your comment.

Lastly, "community", something most people can't even define. What does it mean to you? Every "community" I've ever had the displeasure of being near or in was prone to cliques, tribalism, and groupthink. Any opinion that doesn't match the herd's is attacked until it's silenced. Any attempt to change the status quo is met with strong opposition and sometimes threats against your job, property, or even your life. Where some see community, I see a circlejerk or echochamber.

Correct me if I'm wrong here, but condensing your post down to a few points:

Women don't deserve sexual agency

Everyone should have children and/or sacrifice their life for some so-called good of others

We need a few ill-defined or ill-conceived notions to continue civilization, without outlining why what we currently know as civilization is a good thing.

Do I have that right?

[deleted] • 5 points • 25 June, 2015 03:40 AM

Most of your post is a mix of straw man arguments and undue extrapolation. It's akin to saying "Bob owes me \$5 therefore he owes me \$5,000,000."

You're taking every single one of IM's points, stretching them far beyond anything he actually said, to the point of ridiculousness, then saying his points must be ridiculous.

Angry_Landwhale7 points 24 June, 2015 10:22 PM [recovered]

You might think your post is really good and you have it all figured out.

Neither are true.

Whisper[S] • 12 points • 24 June, 2015 06:38 PM

I may be reading this wrong, but it seems that his ultimate premise is thus: You do not have to act morally as there is no guarantee anyone will act morally to you.

No.

What we call "morality" isn't one giant social contract between everyone. It's millions upon millions of tiny ones.

And for each one, you have to decide for yourself, if there's a contract, if it's valid, if it's enforceable, if the other party broke it first, etc, etc.

My view is that moral codes are a *piece of social technology*, constructed for a purpose. Thus, rather than blindly following them, we would be better advised to evaluate them as tools, look at them from the outside, before deciding what to do.

The red pill means examining things from the outside. Examine what you've been told about women *from the*

outside. Examine what you've been told about Jesus *from the outside*. Examine what you've been told about right and wrong *from the outside*.

What I want for TRP is to have more sophisticated discussions of morality. Ban the sermonizers and finger-wavers, and have conversations like this one, instead.

fake7272 • 2 points • 25 June, 2015 12:10 PM

may I ask what your view on monogamous contracts are? they are pretty much non enforceable because you have no idea if your partner cheats

[deleted] • 5 points • 24 June, 2015 03:52 PM*

If that is your view, **than you are a destroyer of society**, just as complicit as the worst feminist.

Not commenting on your truthfulness of your words, just think it's interesting to see the different responses this message can elicit. Destroyer of society means two very different things.

Materialists/Relativists: To those who see society as nothing more than a coagulation of subjective values and the result of evolution, then this statement is very clinical and lacks emotional pull. Society is just people coming together, deciding to share certain views, and using their shared views to create a structure. If someone opts out of society's contract then their destruction of society is simply them not holding a weight up or them not being part of society's glue.

Universalists/Objectives: To these people your words may be a call to improve society or do your part. Their interpretation of "destroyer of society" fits the word's (intended?) imagery.

Just make sure you take a break every once and while to thank your lucky stars that the men who built what you enjoy didn't feel as you do, even if you only admit it quietly to yourself.

This might be more for hedonists than the nihilists. For the nihilists, I imagine utter indifference. It's nice that people have invented cool toys and fought for liberty, but at the end of the day does it really matter? Pain or pleasure; although one is preferred, both are transient feelings.

"Maman died today. Or yesterday maybe, I don't know."

"A minute later she asked me if I loved her. I told her it didn't mean anything but that I didn't think so."

Thank goodness Adams didn't throw up his arms in defeat and say "fuck fighting this war I'll never see the fruits of. I can't have the pleasure of poetry and music right now, so fuck all those guys in the future. I want mine."

If Adams threw up his arms and Britain won, you would be saying thank goodness King George III stopped the revolution and built the greatest nation(s) and empire on Earth.

Cyralea • 15 points • 24 June, 2015 02:45 PM

you are free to bask in the fruits of what others built and spout nihilism and hedonism to your heart's content.

It's clear that you feel that /u/Whisper's beliefs violate a greater societal contract. That which binds us as humans and allows us to live shoulder to shoulder is being violated by his principles.

Are they? Sure, we can all be grateful for the likes of Adams, but Adams had to sacrifice for the benefit of his descendants. What we have is a typical prisoner's dilemma; those who choose not to take part in the social contract benefit the most. In individualist societies there is no true limiter on breaking these social

contracts.

Compare that to a society like Japan's. It's easy enough to act individualist in their collectivist society, but you suffer the wrath of virtually everyone. You become a social pariah, and suffer for it. **That's how you enforce a contract.** With penalties for not following the terms.

There are no such limitations in Western society. You either break the flimsy contract and reap the benefits, or someone else does while you plow on like a sucker. This is why we say society is in a decline in the West; you won't stop it by being self-sacrificial. You need to wait for enough people to suffer to effect a paradigm shift. That's a ways off.

You only have one life. Take care of yourself, first and foremost.

DarthRoach • 6 points • 24 June, 2015 07:23 PM

This is why liberalism is at its core poison to society. It allows individuals to break the social contract, leading to it being picked apart until society collapses.

draketton • 1 point • 25 June, 2015 02:35 AM

A social contract by its very nature is something that produces rebels which eventually destroy it. It tells everyone who is part of it, from birth, "these are your duties, based on broad strokes generalizations which grew out of our forefathers' experiences." There will always be people who the generalizations don't apply to, and if they aren't free under society's values to break the contract then they will break it violently.

meet_me_at_high_noon • 0 points • 25 June, 2015 02:12 AM

That depends on how you define the social contract. If you believe the social contract to be partially an agreement to balance individual with group freedom, I would argue that both liberalism and conservatism are failures. Neither strikes a good balance.

To me, a former liberal, there are plenty of things that liberalism does right--a belief in racial equality, gay rights, and other issues. Those are beliefs that support creating individual freedom alongside group protection which is the basis of the social contract.

[deleted] • 10 points • 24 June, 2015 01:37 PM

If that is your view, than you are a destroyer of society, just as complicit as the worst feminist.

The destroyers of society are the elites with the power to disincentivize socially-destructive behaviors, but who choose not to. Blaming and shaming ordinary individuals for playing by the fucked up rules they neither wrote nor have any power to rewrite will never change anything, no matter how superior it makes you feel.

savoryprunes • 5 points • 24 June, 2015 06:03 PM

I must say this is the first time I felt compelled to upvote every reply in a thread. This is EXACTLY the type of debate/discussion I like to see on TRP. Very different positions coming together respectfully is a rare find these days.

HellbillyDeluxe • 5 points • 24 June, 2015 04:58 PM

I agree, tRP bemoans the way feminists and SJW's are causing western society to decay and how they have destroyed most of the traditional values of the west. However, according to some because of this it is perfectly fine for men to feel free to do exactly as women have and shirk their responsibilities to their culture and society by not giving a fuck and turning into social degenerates because "hey enjoy the decline!". That is

hypocritical as hell in my opinion. Men should stand for more than that if you ask me, if tRP is truly about becoming better men and facing reality how does becoming what you loathe accomplish that? You can't complain about the fall of society and directly participate in making it happen. Advocating for that type of mentality is like a Fireman becoming the best fireman he can be then running around throwing fuel on the flames of fires he is called on to put out. Shouldn't he be working hard to put them out even if it is a lost cause, not fanning the flames? Shouldn't men stand for more than primal instincts and sensory gratification? I certainly think so. If not how are they any different than the women they decry? Men can be more than Machiavellian animals driven by self pleasure and gain. That is how women act, this sub understands that, yet everyday men are advocating the same types of behavior here. If you ask me you can keep the "if you can beat em' join them" mentality, because that my friend is the attitude of a defeated group. To me tRP is more than just pickin up pussy, it is a oasis of knowledge to help men become better and improve their lives,relationships, and the society they live in so their sons and grandsons won't have the same struggles.

NightGod • 0 points • 25 June, 2015 05:35 AM

You can't complain about the fall of society and directly participate in making it happen.

I don't complain about the fall of society. I accept that it has happened and go along for the ride.

HellbillyDeluxe • 3 points • 25 June, 2015 07:31 AM

Along for the ride means you're a passenger. I don't want to be a passenger, I want to be the driver. A true man is a driver. He drives himself,his family, his community, and collectively with other like minded individuals drives the whole world. Enjoy the ride partner, we will take it from here.

NidStyles • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 01:23 PM

As a confirmed and proud shitlord, I support your post. I am very grateful for what little in my life has been granted to me by my ancestors.

I however will not produce anything for future generations without being sure that they will get it.

thefisherman1961 • -4 points • 24 June, 2015 01:29 PM

Thank goodness Adams didn't throw up his arms in defeat and say "fuck fighting this war I'll never see the fruits of. I can't have the pleasure of poetry and music right now, so fuck all those guys in the future. I want mine."

Why? The Constitution is a failure.

2012Aceman • 5 points • 24 June, 2015 04:55 PM

The Constitution is not a failure, we failed it. We promised as Americans to exemplify individual strength, to pay attention, and we cashed it in for collective mediocrity. Everybody equal! Everybody shamed! And we took out or just plain ignore the parts of the Constitution that were put there to protect us from rulers.

meet_me_at_high_noon • 2 points • 25 June, 2015 02:14 AM

Well it also allowed things like slavery. It really isnt as strongly in favor of individual freedom as it first appears.

2012Aceman • 1 point • 25 June, 2015 11:20 AM

It started by allowing slavery, although the Declaration of Independence clearly spells out that

slavery was going to be done away with. A nation cannot be founded on ideals like that and not eliminate slavery. The problem was there was no way to ban slavery at the start of the Revolution because the free North needed the South's manpower and finances, and because they needed to be united against Britain. And there was no way the South would agree to give up slaves without a fight, which is why later on we had to have a war to end it. Think of the Declaration of Independence sort of like a promissory note to the slaves that one day they would be free in America.

Americans cast off the monarchy and later fought a war to end slavery, and the Jews were the first people to rise up as slaves and say no more. And those are the two most vilified cultures globally, I wonder why.

meet_me_at_high_noon • 1 point • 25 June, 2015 03:05 PM

I understand what you're saying but every historian, myself included, understands nothing is guaranteed in history. The declaration argues that all men are born equal, but its important to remember that leading up to the civil war, men like stephen douglass, john calhoun, and robert barnwell rhett were convincing many people that the declaration needed to be thrown out and that lincoln was arguing it was at the core of the american promise. The declaration did not set slaves on a course to freedom. There had to be a heavy debate and blood spilt to get there. I respect your opinion and you arent entirely wrong but reading what people were saying in the pre civil war era its clear that the declaration was not viewed as the crux of american life.

thefisherman1961 • 0 points • 24 June, 2015 05:25 PM

The Constitution was a failure because some parts were written in such an ambiguous way that they were misinterpreted in favor of the collective over the individual. It needs to be scrapped. Democracy has proven itself to be equivalent to tyranny because the democratic majority always votes itself into tyranny. We must dismantle the state and let individuals in the free market voluntarily decide how to run their own lives.

2012Aceman • 1 point • 25 June, 2015 11:30 AM

The only state we must dismantle is the nanny state. It is only through coddling that the people become so weak and so stupid as to vote themselves into slavery. It is only through an education department under state control that people forget the lessons of history. It is only through social service programs that a permanent underclass of the impoverished is created, totally dependent on state aid and therefore totally beholden to them.

The problem is just as you stated: you and everyone else in America thinks this is a democracy. No. It was supposed to be a Republic. A democracy is nothing but anarchy voted on by the masses, since the laws are in a state of constant flux because feelings change day to day and the law changes with it. Now I'll grant you, it acts more like a Democracy today. With the passage of the 17th Amendment America stopped being a Republic because we made Senators elected by popular vote instead of by their own State's Senates, as the Constitution was originally written. The advantage to Senators being voted on by their own State Senate is because that way the States would have the most power in government, not the fed. This created a check against the federal government running roughshod over the States. So we got rid of that provision, and a hundred years later look where we are: the federal government could care less what the States think about any issue (immigration, finances, health insurance, etc) and they are also in complete control of them.

The problem is the people. The people need to hold their government accountable in any system of government, otherwise the government just becomes an all powerful ruling class until the next Revolution comes.

thefisherman1961 • 1 point • 25 June, 2015 06:53 PM

The problem is just as you stated: you and everyone else in America thinks this is a democracy. No. It was supposed to be a Republic. A democracy is nothing but anarchy voted on by the masses, since the laws are in a state of constant flux because feelings change day to day and the law changes with it. Now I'll grant you, it acts more like a Democracy today. With the passage of the 17th Amendment America stopped being a Republic because we made Senators elected by popular vote instead of by their own State's Senates, as the Constitution was originally written.

democracy - government by the people; a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised directly by them or by their elected agents under a free electoral system.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/democracy>

The US is and always has been a democracy. It's possible to be both a democracy and republic at the same time.

The advantage to Senators being voted on by their own State Senate is because that way the States would have the most power in government, not the fed. This created a check against the federal government running roughshod over the States. So we got rid of that provision, and a hundred years later look where we are: the federal government could care less what the States think about any issue (immigration, finances, health insurance, etc) and they are also in complete control of them.

The Fed does not have the most power in government even after the amendment was passed.

The problem is the people. The people need to hold their government accountable in any system of government, otherwise the government just becomes an all powerful ruling class until the next Revolution comes.

They never will because democracy always votes itself into tyranny. Despite being the best system of government anybody has been able to come up with, democracy and the state are threats to Liberty and both must be wiped off the face of the planet.

Bandler_Deangelo8 points 24 June, 2015 11:58 AM* **[recovered]**

OP thinks it's laudable (not necessarily "correct", or mandatory) to take actions that will limit the brutality of social conditions for the next generation. This is an extension of what RP is anyway: a collective effort to make life less toxic or dehumanizing for men in our present generation.

What is sickening, at least in America, is the frequency of young women who automatically regard elder males as "old pervs" or "creeps"... reducing them – purely based on appearance – to the most negative, unsympathetic caricature of a person.

The gross irony here is that a lot of these guys probably spent a lifetime working their asses off, paying taxes, making contributions to the community and ***fighting in wars*** so that their granddaughters could live free, safe, wealthy lives in democratic society. And the thanks they get is being glared at by the same pampered, ungrateful,

hostile women (who couldn't conceive of being shipped off to war, or spending 40+ years working hard labor jobs), while they're just shuffling through the market trying to buy a quart of milk.

savoryprunes • 4 points • 24 June, 2015 06:07 PM

Boom. Just boom. Can we gild the second and third paragraphs and make classrooms read it instead of reciting the Pledge of Allegiance?

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 June, 2015 03:51 PM

Its not just our generation. Nobody really gave a fuck that these men were giving up their lives for their country. It was all part of a narrative told to them to convince them to go fight. The politicians and women had every reason to push this narrative on the men. Once they are safe and secure they can resume treating the men like shit. Many of the men who died for our country in the major wars were beta as fuck. But they were also trapped into it because they were not allotted the time or power needed (by women/politicians) to be alpha and stay safe at home.

Code_Bordeauxx • 16 points • 24 June, 2015 07:35 AM

Brilliant analysis, you really hit the core with this one. But there is one thing I object to:

we cannot simply ask "What is right?", as if morals were a single, universal absolute

People always say this around here, but I disagree. And the reason for that ties in with the second contract you mention. You want to know what is morally wrong? You ask yourself the question: "if many people were to do that, would it be detrimental to society?". And then you have your answer. Would it be bad for society if many men steal? Yes. Would it be bad for society if many men sleep with other people's wives? Of course. So these things are objectively morally wrong.

What is good or bad can be easily established, but it is also of lesser importance. The million dollar question is **"what is my incentive to make the sacrifice of acting morally good?"** And so we are back at your contracts. From there I agree.

MoneyStatusLooks • 8 points • 24 June, 2015 10:30 AM [recovered]

I like where your going but I don't understand why 'if something is bad for society' it makes it automatically morally wrong.

Eating McDonalds, or smoking, or drinking, is bad for society, it does not make it morally wrong. You see there is a problem with your logic?

Code_Bordeauxx • 4 points • 24 June, 2015 10:55 AM*

On the contrary, not taking care of yourself and thus being a burden to those around you is certainly immoral in my opinion. As long as it is a conscious decision of course. One can wonder if this is the case with food, substance and alcohol addiction. With the addition of it having to be a conscious decision, I stick to my definition. But thanks for your critical input.

(this comment should be where the deleted one is)

[deleted] 24 June, 2015 10:38 AM*

[permanently deleted]

MoneyStatusLooks • 8 points • 24 June, 2015 10:52 AM [recovered]

So then because it's morally wrong, according to you, they should ban and make McDonalds illegal?

Or is it just a bit morally wrong, therefore okay? What about chocolate, or cookies, where do you draw the line? Or is it only morally wrong if you eat them every day, and not morally wrong if you eat them as a cheat from time to time? Who are you to say what is and what is moral in regards to the frequency of McDonalds usage.

Do you get what i'm saying, it's possibly to stretch your logic to absurdity. Therefore it's unlikely correct.

Code_Bordeauxx • 3 points • 24 June, 2015 11:03 AM*

Sorry, reposted because of many edits. I would say there is a big difference between what is immoral and what we should actively condemn. That is a whole new discussion even. People are not perfect, so you need some leeway. Maybe indeed the consequences in the case of eating fast food are not severe enough to make it illegal. Then again, ethically and medically you could certainly build a case for it, which people also have tried in the past. I will not claim that my definition is a perfect one (and I think with such a complex subject you will always have grey areas no matter your theory), but it is still much better than seeing morals as entirely subjective.

OhAndOneMoreThing • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 12:26 PM*

Eating it doesn't make it morally wrong...mass media propaganda and toys to brainwash children into associating their death food with fun and birthdays so that by the time they are chubby adults they continue to go there for comfort is morally wrong.

iamz3ro • 0 points • 24 June, 2015 08:17 AM*

Just want to add in, without any strings attached:

Would it be bad for society if many men sleep with other people's wives? Of course. So these things are objectively morally wrong.

Which is what is happening in the world now. Think: Swingers Parties. So quite literally, men around the world are breaking the "moral contract" and are loving it.

So next time someone says that you shouldn't sleep with someones wife, tell them "well what about the thousands of couples all over the USA who are willingly breaking said "moral contract"?"

mate96 • 11 points • 24 June, 2015 09:51 AM

Mutual agreement to engage in an open relationship or swingers parties is NOT the same contract as a couple who agreed to be monogamous.

iamz3ro • -5 points • 24 June, 2015 10:05 AM

Yes it is. Married couples have a moral contract with the rest of society to only have sex with each other and no one else.

Code_Bordeauxx • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 10:49 AM

Oh come on people. Yes what he says is completely irrelevant in a practical sense. On a philosophical level he may be right though. Whether you agree or not, the guy is providing us with some critical thoughts, no need to downvote.

iamz3ro • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 11:00 AM

I get it all the time. But thank you. Btw: I was not actually disagreeing with anyone, I just

wanted to add my 2c

OhAndOneMoreThing • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 03:35 PM

It's an absolutely ridiculous comparison. Marriage is not a moral contract with the rest of society. It is a legal contract between man and wife, and a religious contract between the couple and God.

On a side note, is down-voting not for comments we disagree with? I will gladly undo mine if they are supposed to be reserved for flaming/inappropriate behavior.

Code_Bordeauxx • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 09:13 PM

No, in fact it is not a disagree button. At least not in this sub. Take your cursor, hover it over the downvote button and read. "Still plugged in". That is more than a gimmick, you know. It means that you downvote if what someone says runs contrary to RP theory or what they say is factually not true. We are not here to discourage critical thought. Instead, we discuss it.

iamz3ro • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 10:20 PM

Then explains where I'm wrong then, I'm interested.

OhAndOneMoreThing • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 11:16 PM

I did explain.

It's an absolutely ridiculous comparison. Marriage is not a moral contract with the rest of society. It is a legal contract between man and wife, and a religious contract between the couple and God.

You sign a document called a marriage license. Legal contract. You swear to God in the presence of witnesses (family, friends). Religious contract.

Code_Bordeauxx • 1 point • 25 June, 2015 11:19 AM*

It can be both a legal contract, a religious contract and a moral contract all at the same time, you know. As I stated earlier, morals can be viewed as behaviour meant to benefit (a healthy) society. Under normal circumstances, society wants you to find a wife, stay together and have/raise kids together. Any *willful* deviation from that could technically be seen as immoral, even more so when there are kids involved. Remember, people who failed to marry or who divorced used to be actively shamed and shunned by society. This stems from moral notions. Now, I am aware that this is pushing it, mainly because this information is practically useless. Morality isn't going to stop people from divorcing. But it is a philosophical view that can be defended. iamz3ro noticed that, but he failed to further clarify.

Now, this aspect of it having to be willful can also be used as a counter argument. One could argue that while the choice to divorce is a deliberate one, people generally do not enter a marriage that they know will fail. At this point it becomes very complicated and I personally do not care to explore this further, I am only trying to make you aware that both of your arguments have merit and neither of you is necessarily wrong.

OhAndOneMoreThing • -6 points • 24 June, 2015 12:29 PM

what is my incentive to make the sacrifice of acting morally good?

wtf. That is a very Patrick Bateman-esque question. It's not a million dollar question though, because if you would even ask it then you don't have to worry about morality because you only care about yourself.

Code_Bordeauxx • 4 points • 24 June, 2015 01:05 PM*

You misunderstand. I think under normal circumstances there is a base incentive to do good because you value society and those around you. But I can understand when people no longer want to adhere to general morality because they feel deserted by their environment. This is not how I personally feel, but that is irrelevant. My point is that negative incentives can counteract the base level positive incentive, with abandoning morality as a result.

OhAndOneMoreThing • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 01:11 PM

I get what you're saying, my point is that as soon as one considers whether there is an incentive to act morally, it defeats the purpose.

Code_Bordeauxx • 3 points • 24 June, 2015 01:21 PM

Not if that incentive is that you value society and wish to continue living in a functional one; being willing to be part of the collective effort to make that possible.

OhAndOneMoreThing • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 03:41 PM

I guess this is all contingent on whether or not one believes that it's possible to ever exhibit selfless behavior. For example, if you pass a homeless person (*assuming they are actually starving, not a junkie con-artist*) and he asks for change to buy food.

In your philosophical opinion, is it possible to make that decision and not be influenced by your personal enjoyment of helping people or wishing to avoid the negative emotions of guilt, etc?

Code_Bordeauxx • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 04:42 PM

Perhaps some are capable of it, but I do not think 'pure selflessness' is a factor in the vast majority of people. There is always some form of ego involved. I have yet to observe it any other way.

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 June, 2015 01:22 PM

Society hasn't been planting trees for men since the 70s. I give no fucks about ever selflessly planting any of my own. If we just shut up and do what is expected of us, then society will never learn from their mistakes.

I am perfectly happy to sit back and let them swallow their medicine. Enjoy the collapse!

[deleted] • 10 points • 24 June, 2015 06:36 AM

Moral is fair weather parameter. It exists only when we feel the weather around us is fair. When weather turns from cooperation to competition, It goes out of windows. It's upon us to decide whether environment around us is fair or not. Somebody believe it is fair and some don't. Those who believe its fair outside plant trees.

Great post OP!

What this means is that morals are a contract. We hold up our end of the bargain, and others hold up theirs. But there are many different contracts, and many different people to have contracts with. Whenever we are faced with a moral question, we cannot simply ask "What is right?", as if morals were a single, universal absolute. We must ask **"What is the contract?"**, **"Who is it with?"**, and, most importantly **"Have they kept their end of the bargain?"**.

This is the right mindset to have when evaluating your course of action given any situation that might present you a moral dilemma.

/u/illimitableman has a very good article which I encourage everyone to read in order to get further insights on the subject. (I read it again yesterday).

It is moral to act in a moral way with those that uphold their part of the bargain but it is not (most of the times) in your best interest to do so with those that don't.

EDIT: wording.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 June, 2015 04:09 PM*

It's always necessary to figure out when another is left with the goods and you're left with nothing but virtue. If it's the latter, then I personally choose to get the fuck out of it. Morals are the manipulative bullshit that gets betas to self sacrifice. TRP isn't about looking for someone else's approval, acting like a nice little boy and getting dat adult validation just doesn't apply to us. We're at war with greater society, not as a group but as each individual. Society made us second class citizens and expects us to sacrifice for it some more. Fuck it.

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 June, 2015 12:14 AM*

I have problems with this post.

You shift far too much of your own morality onto the actions and intentions of others. Your morals are produced by your soul and shaped by your experience, simply saying "No one did good for me, so I won't do good for anyone." is a decay mentality to culture and to the emotional self.

"A society grows great when old men plant trees in whose shade they know they shall never sit." - Greek Proverb

Why would anyone plant a tree for someone else? What would cause a man to do such a selfless thing?

Why did Michelangelo paint so intricately?

Why did Einstein think so deeply?

Why did Emerson write so beautifully?

With emotion comes a longing for beauty, because beauty breeds happiness. Really, they're synonymous.

The trees of this proverb are a physical metaphor for good. Every man alive has had good done for them. Your mother did *everything* for you for 9 months. Whether she abandoned you after that or not, there is still 9 months of pure shady tree that you sat under. **To think no one has ever done anything for you is the greatest solipsism.**

But, that doesn't matter. Regardless of anyone showing you mercy, if you are in a position to help another, why would you not? It is true that you must love yourself first and foremost, but when you truly love yourself you see the abundance of love within you.

Live with an abundance mentality in love just as with women. That's how you achieve emotional success as well as sexual success.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 07:57 AM

Deconstruct, then reconstruct.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 01:32 PM

There's no real need to follow any morals if you don't want, but in contrast prepare and be willing to accept the consequences if you don't.

Feel free to fuck the wife but be fully prepared for the guy that may knock on your door and commit a murder suicide

Or as a woman fuck as many people as possible but don't expect a guy to marry you

TheColdDark • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 03:54 PM

What happened to "keep your morals to yourself"?

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 04:25 PM

The determining factor here, along with a husband, is a child. I'd prefer to keep the red pill out of the mouth of a child until he/she is ready to take it, when it's most applicable in his/her life.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 06:33 PM

It seems you're leaving out a key fact:

There's a part of your brain that knows whether you are a tree-planter or a tree-burner and assigns you confidence and moral authority accordingly.

Morality is not just a social contract. Morality is a part of the brain. The book *The Moral Animal* goes into detail on this.

Social contracts aside, its wise to plant trees purely to keep your brain healthy and functioning smoothly.

let_terror_reign • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 11:34 PM

One of the major points of trp is to recognize that neural programing can be overwritten.

RedPill_MD • 4 points • 24 June, 2015 06:28 AM

Brother, I needed this BAD.

Thank you.

Time to get off our fucking asses collectively and make firm decisions based on sound choices.

I've recently been observing the "planters" of these generational trees. The path laid out for you is in the shade of the tree that beckons you. FIND OUT WHO PLANTED THAT TREE. Your mission/path/CORE TRUTH can be found in the hand of the person who sowed that seed.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 June, 2015 02:36 PM

Wasn't there just an announcement a few days ago regarding bringing morality up at TRP?

savoryprunes • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 06:19 PM

This post is a thoughtful examination of what morality is and also an invitation to discuss/debate and find your own view. The problem addressed by the announcement you referenced was a trend of "preaching" that was disrupting thoughtful discussion.

LeFlamel • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 07:40 PM

Ban hammers build echo chambers.

thefisherman1961 • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 01:35 PM

Whenever we are faced with a moral question, we cannot simply ask "What is right?", as if morals were a single, universal absolute.

That is absolutely false. Without the Golden and Silver Rules (it's immoral to initiate force against another individual), morality does not exist. Therefore, it is objectively immoral to initiate force against another individual.

When asking yourself, "What is right?", the first thing everyone should ask themselves is "Do my actions constitute an initiation of force against an individual?" If so, then you are being objectively immoral. If the answer is no, then it's up to your own subjective morality to decide what you think.

let_terror_reign • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 11:33 PM

What are these rules? I've never heard of them before.

thefisherman1961 • 1 point • 25 June, 2015 05:40 AM

Golden Rule: Treat others as you wish to be treated.

Silver Rule: Don't treat others as you don't wish to be treated.

Initiating force against an individual is objectively treating them as they don't wish to be treated, and it is also objectively not treating them as they wish to be treated. Initiating force is also the only thing that objectively violates both rules. Aside from that, how you apply the Golden/Silver rules is subjective.

OhAndOneMoreThing • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 12:25 PM

I think the idea of morals, for me, is not that I HAVE to do anything. It's simply the idea that if I didn't have the benefit of sitting in the shade because no one planted any trees, and I was uncomfortable, then I WANT to plant a tree so someone can have the benefit of a luxury that I did not. It's altruism. There's nothing wrong with doing good things that benefit others. Our society is devolving because everyone is out for themselves.

f04ee231826c6c0 • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 01:08 PM

You've attempted to rewrite integrity in terms of loyalty. "I want to do RIGHT by X" where X is "mom", "the Fuhrer", "god", "my ancestors", "the Constitution", or whatever. It's true that loyalty is the magnetic field that orients the moral compass. But it's also true that integrity is loyalty to self, not in a selfish way, but in a way that puts one's innate knowledge of right and wrong above everything else. So, you CAN describe morality in terms of loyalty, but only if that loyalty is to your own knowledge of right and wrong. Only the special case in "morality = loyalty to X" where "X = self" preserves one's integrity.

savoryprunes • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 06:13 PM

Thank you for posting this well thought and well presented opinion. OP, you have spurred one of the best discussions/debates I have seen.

Mouthpiece • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 07:00 PM

If you find yourself roasting in the sun, the question is not whether someone has planted a tree for you, the question is whether you should plant a tree for the future so that others may have shade.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 12:44 PM

But I'm an atomistic individualistic hedonist that imagines myself as an alien being trapped in a body which I did not choose. I want this, then I want that, and nobody can tell me what to do.

So you are **reality oppressing** me now by forcing me to think beyond my atomistic micro-world and consider the "bigger picture".

Oppressor !!!

(sarcasm)

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 June, 2015 03:26 PM

I know you're joking, but you really haven't provided any refutation to that viewpoint. It's difficult to do. What do you say to sees reality as matter interaction, values as subjective labels, and societal goals/beliefs as evolutionary adaptations? What is their motivation to plant trees?

Only possible arguments I see involve convincing them that it's in their best interests to contribute to society. You can't really argue from the moral perspective ("individualism is bad", "good people ought to..") as morality is just another subjective label.

I want this, then I want that, and nobody can tell me what to do.

? People can say whatever they want.

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 24 June, 2015 08:47 PM

When you are aware of natural hierarchy then you value your family and your immediate kin. There a benefits to the survival of your tribe when you act in the long term interests of your tribe.

The **alien being** problem of atomistic individualism is that people are so disconnected from natural hierarchies that they stop caring.

Once this happens it's a downward spiral.

The mice cage experiments proved this. Overpopulation broke down social cohesion and the mice became atomistic and the whole mice colony died out from indifference.