

How the Feminine Imperative is Destroying Reddit... on Purpose

898 upvotes | 15 July, 2015 | by redpillschool

While I don't much care for the drama taking place in the greater reddit, we just recently saw a new announcement from our new CEO letting us know that we've just traded one master for another, and free speech is on the chopping block in favor of making reddit a safer, cleaner environment, absent the dark underbelly that erodes reddit's morals.

I thought it would be worth while to analyze what's going on here, because it's actually very relevant to what we study here at TRP.

Those of you unfamiliar with the term "Feminine Imperative," it basically boils down to this (borrowed from Rollo's blog):

The Feminine Imperative is the presumption of a feminine reality. It is a pervasive set of memes and conventions which shift the ownership of women's personal liabilities for their sexual strategy to men.

It is this very imperative that defines the mainstream culture we live in today, shifting criticism and critique away from females and their strategy, and imposing values on men.

Looking at today's culture, just the discussion of female sexual strategy labels our board as women haters and sexists. Our entire political system is built around appeasing women and their made-up threats- the rape hysteria, the wage gap.

You are either found in accordance with the feminine imperative, or you are found committing political suicide.

It's the effect that produces these following nuggets:

- If he cheats on her, he's an asshole. If she cheats on him, it was because he was an asshole.
- If she has no-strings-attached sex with him, she's expressing her sexuality. If he has sex with her and won't commit, he's a asshole who used her.
- If a man and woman are both drunk and have sex, he raped her.

All of these are "true" by social convention. It's obvious when you look for it, but it's "true" because most people aren't looking for it.

Rollo often refers to this as "the matrix" and it's where we've gotten our name "the red pill" from, which is breaking free from the feminine imperative to understand what is really taking place.

We ask ourselves, in what way do these views and beliefs help us? And we discover that they don't.

In the 90's there was an extreme push in our culture for men to get in touch with their softer side, to embrace feelings and focus on equality and communication with women. We were taught that the best way to attract a woman is to be open and honest and tell them how we feel. Don't be the macho asshole, be the underdog nice guy who understands your feelings. Anybody who wants to deny that would have at least two decades of movies and television shows to answer for.

The reasoning in our minds was that women were looking for this new version of masculinity- any why wouldn't we believe it? Feminism spent a lot of time convincing us that women were oppressed, and that it was men and masculinity keeping them down. So we believed them and did what they wanted.

And it created this world of peter pan boys who didn't grow up and needed a website to teach them what

the hell being a man actually is.

This is the Feminine Imperative. And it survives and thrives off of two factors that I can think of:

1. It utilizes the male's proclivity for wanting to comply with or help women in need in an effort to win her favor and have sex.
2. It tirelessly breaks into male spaces to make sure number one can take place.

The feminine imperative cleverly disguises itself as morality, so once broken into a male space, it uses these mechanisms to inject feminine values and use social norms (or shaming) to try to temper the discourse and modify the tone.

From Rollo's [Male Space](#):

Men unaccustomed to having women in their midst generally react in two ways; According to their proper feminized conditioning, they embrace the opportunity to impress these 'trailblazing' women (hoping to be found worthy of intimacy) with their enthusiastic acceptance of, and identification with, their feminine overseer(s), or they become easy foils of an "outmoded" way of thinking that the new 'in-group' happily labels them with.

There is no coincidence that the new politically correct movement, and social justice warriors, and feminists all overlap. They all have one thing in common- they are to appease women above all.

And the end goal is easy to spot. When discussion is open and free, the danger that takes place is a new cultural morality that may take hold in a portion of the population. This is a direct threat to the feminine imperative. The very discussion of sexual strategy (and women) leads us to discover that most mainstream values and ideas are actually nothing more than a cover for women's behavior, and this type of discussion can only lead to less compliance by men, and ultimately disrupt the freedom that women have for their own sexual strategy (hypergammy).

So they tone police and frame it as morality, but make no mistake the end goal is to prevent discussion from happening that does not conform to the feminine imperative. Because the very discussion is a threat. Knowledge is a threat.

Interestingly enough, the administrators at Reddit may very well be unknowing pawns in this battle. Because we know the feminine imperative frames itself socially as morality, the admin and CEO aren't necessarily making moves because advertisers are actually putting pressure on them, but instead they believe they are making moves because they are moral and right, and that if the feminine imperative is to be believed, the business and advertisers will be quick to jump on board. Because it is *right*.

How could people be so lead astray? We already know that a number of red pillers (or those at the red pill apologetic center purplepilldebate) try to pay lip service to this feminine imperative. I see it time and time again, in quotes like:

"I agree with most of TRP, there's some good stuff there... I just don't know why they have to go so far into that hate stuff..."

or

"There's some good advice there, but it's ruined by how much hatred and anger there is..."

You know what you'll never catch me doing? Denouncing the anger, the fringe, or any of the extreme elements of The Red Pill. You know why? Because it serves absolutely no purpose but to appease the feminine imperative. And once that sneaky little bitch gets her foot in the door, that's when the race to the bottom begins.

I embrace the anger, and every single dirty fringe idea we have on here. Not because I agree with everybody, no. I embrace it because it is our strength and protection against the feminine imperative. I embrace it because tone policing and topic policing *is* a race to the bottom. I embrace it because either it belongs here, or we perish as a forum.

People have asked me time and time again if we can remove some of the "dirtier" elements of trp, or change the language to be more palatable to the greater reddit. I have always, and will always say: NO. Reddit is in a race to the bottom. When they decided the first round of unsightly or distasteful subreddits needed to go, they started the countdown. The feminine imperative will never be satisfied, and will continue its work until there is nothing left. Every time reddit cuts off what they believe to be the worst 10%, a new worst 10% is created.

And that's exactly what the feminine imperative does.

If you haven't already, you may reserve your reddit username on Puerarchy for use on our off-site backup board in case of emergency. We have no plans to move to the new forums unless we are being shut down, but you're welcome to register now! <http://www.puerarchy.com/verify/index.php>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

dr_warlock • 196 points • 15 July, 2015 05:37 PM*

The feminine imperative will never be satisfied.

That's what hypergamy is, the foundation of the female imperative. **It's perpetual, it never ends. There is no summit. Women are always looking to trade up.** It's the driver for everything we're seeing today. It requires that a woman constantly hurls nonsense at men to test them for fitness to find out who the 'alphas' are. The problem is that the majority of men believe this shit and take it seriously (shit test failed). They believe that when a woman feigns anger or sadness, they've done something wrong. **Incorrect.** Those same men have a vote of equal weight. Betas + whiteknights + SJW's + Women (50%) = Vast majority of the population. They control everything that matters: political voice and consumer dollars. As /u/Rollo-Tomassi said in his post, "The Political is Personal", women are using people's emotional appeal to women's suffering to convince others [men] to strip away their own rights little by little through the legal system in order to optimize their dualistic sexual strategy (AF/BB) and appease an **immediate** feeling (We know women's feelings are fickle and constantly change). Then they ask for special treatment and entitlements to shield them from responsibility as reparations for all the 'sins' of the evil patriarchy against women for so many millennia. The government has found it useful and now continues to promote it for its own gains.

Feminism is founded on dogma because it can't stand to scrutiny. Never question, blindly obey. As with all false ideologies, shaming and taboos are used to inhibit thought. "A tactic used by those strong enough to enforce it, but weak enough to need it." It requires indoctrination to sustain itself.

Feminism is parasitic. It siphons resources from society through the state to aid in bad reproductive and consumerist decisions.

Feminism is only destructive, never involved in creation because the feminine spirit desires everything to appease its own fickle emotional well being. Because women are inferior, society is required to tone police and bring everything down to appease women, to meet the lowest common denominator. These declared feelings are shallow though, and will only make them more angry for solving their proclaimed problems because that is not what they really want. Women do not say what they mean. **The female imperative is not supposed to work 100% of the time.** It is a mechanism implemented in women to weed out genetic losers but eventually run into a man who puts her in her place, what she really desires.

Feminism is a society wide shit test. We are failing miserably. The beta bux strategy didn't work the first time? Let's double down! That will surely satisfy women!

The drops of hate we find here is what gives us our fire. It's fuel for our purpose. Anger when properly channeled, can accomplish great things. A little hate is sometimes required to combat remnants from previous conditioning and biological drives that once had a place in the sexual market, but no longer work and will more than likely result in failure. Let the hate flow and dissipate when ready.

Schrodingersdawg • 88 points • 15 July, 2015 07:31 PM*

The most insidious part about it all is how much it fits into the "slippery slope" situation.

Remember when the conservatives were anti-gay in the 90's? "Men marrying dogs next, men changing to women, etc." Everyone lambasted them, called them bigots. But now trans-abled is a thing. For those of you who don't know, those are people who identify as disabled, so they willingly pay thousands of dollars to surgically lose their limbs. I will freely admit that I thought of conservatives' claims at that time to be insane as well. Then they were proved right.

Everywhere that women exist, they will try to push the envelope. In personal relationships, in the workplace, in politics. I am majoring in computer science and the amount of "you shouldn't say that it hurts feelings" comes from women and beta males only.

It's like water slowly eroding the cliff face. The more I read the news and hear about events, the more I get convinced that the only way to resist the feminine imperative is to never give an inch. Only active prevention will work, because by doing nothing, they will gain ground.

What will happen when the moderates are constantly overruled by the extremists for a few more years? When even a neutral stance gets you labelled as a misogynist? When all politicians have to enthusiastically suck the feminist Sarkeesian strap-on even harder than Obama does currently?

As JFK said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

I'm curious what will happen as more men realise being a moderate in the feminist push will do nothing for them. The Jacobins beheaded others for not being radical enough. Then they will realise being a moderate against the feminist push is still not enough, because of the aforementioned slippery slope.

We're already seeing the resurgence of right-wing ideologies in the liberal countries of Western Europe. When the pendulum swings back, will fascism, the great enemy of communism, rise again?

Personally, I believe that the only available recourse to the feminine imperative in politics is fascism. It's sad that the radical feminists have created an environment where the only way to resist them is to become a radical in turn.

And so there we are. I can't believe in democracy - at least how we have it here in America anymore. The founding fathers kept voting to a small class for a reason. Now, it's all bread and circuses until the system collapses.

Kernes • 9 points • 16 July, 2015 09:30 AM

the more I get convinced that the only way to resist the feminine imperative is to never give an inch.

Oh yes. Here in Sweden you can get death threats for posting this <http://i.imgur.com/JQXEs03.png> It is never enough for them.

raredare359 • 2 points • 21 July, 2015 11:35 PM*

I don't know why you're putting feminism and gay people in the same boat. Back in Ancient Rome/Greece, before birth control and condoms, men were hooking up with men ALL the time. Bisexuality was considered the DEFAULT sexuality. Men fucked men for pleasure and women were "kept around" for reproductive and family purposes. Did they enjoy having sex with women? Absolutely. But that usually resulted in child after child and a man's form of release could only be found in the form of another man.

Very ignorant. The only reason you have a "stigma" against bisexuality now is because of Christianity. Women are also quick to demonize gay/bisexual men because it lowers the price of sex. How can they control you if gay men are practically begging to suck your dick? You'll have a much

harder (if not practically impossible) time falling in love with a man but I think we can all agree that sex does not require love.

Seriously...your G spot evolved to be in your ASS.

Wake up, sheeple, you think you've shed yourself of the "feminine imperative" but your anti-gay comments say otherwise. The most Red Pill people I've ever met are gay. For those that have been brainwashed by feminists, they are quickly saved if you remind them of Red Pill truths without using Red Pill lingo....unlike beta men, who swear up and down that women are victimized.

trialstroublestribs • 22 points • 15 July, 2015 09:43 PM [recovered]

Interesting post. I've thought of Feminism as a vehicle to get people to support fascism. With socialism and our current feminism a lot of politically correct social rules and dogma are forced onto people using shame, fear and other manipulative tactics. When the government starts pairing with private organizations like Facebook/Google/Reddit to weed out political dissidents (people who are openly against Feminism/Political Correctness) then we have government working with private business to further enslave it's people which is fascist in nature.

Schrodingersdawg • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 03:09 PM

You have to be careful when lumping political ideologies together. Fascism is not the same as communism, which is not the same as totalitarianism.

What you've described is actually pure capitalism - it reminds me of all the shady trust and anti-trust issues circling Standard Oil at the turn of the century.

The principle behind fascism is that the classes should unite to help one another, that everyone that worked hard was entitled to a slice of the pie. Communism and feminism encourages class conflict. Capitalism encourages a dog-eat-dog race to the top.

Hitler revitalised the German economy by encouraging women to stay at home so labor costs would rise. When women work, a society becomes more economically stratified because women tend to go for richer men. By making the workforce primarily men, he let wages rise across the board for the working class, and with more men working, this led to more people in the middle class. He also combated inflation by requiring all new Marks to be printed only if something of equivalent value was produced. Does some of this sound familiar?

Furthermore, his public works project destroyed unemployment. Imagine if the money we spent on tanks that the Pentagon says we don't need was instead used to build housing, or repair highways, or for the schools.

Germany's economic recovery was a miracle, and while they racked up huge debt, the only difference between it and the US now is that people are willing to lend to us.

I'm sure some blue piller will come in and say I'm defending Hitler. A guy who championed animal rights and ran anti-smoking campaigns.

Just because he did something doesn't make it wrong.

RedPillarOfSalt • 2 points • 17 July, 2015 10:46 AM

You have to be careful when lumping political ideologies together. Fascism is not the same as communism, which is not the same as totalitarianism.

Only one of those is a true political ideology (communism). Fascism is a method of enforcing any ideology which embraces it. Totalitarianism is a description of gov't authority level.

You could have a fascist, totalitarian, communist gov't, or a non-fascist, totalitarian communist gov't. You could also have a fascist, egalitarian democracy. You could have a non-fascist totalitarian gynocracy if you want to.

These terms are not mutually exclusive or necessarily interrelated.

totorox • 1 point • 21 July, 2015 08:42 AM

Whoa finally a bit of light on these terms. Thx.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 07:16 PM

Perhaps a better example would be the guy who ran Singapore for decades, his name escapes me. Strict motherfucker but his people have flourished.

RedPillarOfSalt • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 10:48 AM

Lee Kuan Yew. He died recently. He made Singapore an economic powerhouse, but he's also why some basic freedoms are severely limited and why Singapore is a boring fucking cultural desert.

CAlgaryimport • 1 point • 21 July, 2015 02:36 AM

Hitler made Germany into a super power able to take the french and British empires on. Truly commendable economics.

NidStyles • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 03:55 AM

The female imperative is inherently the driving factor behind socialism and communism. Fascism is the male reaction to this push.

Schrodingersdawg • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 02:55 PM

Don't know why you're being downvoted. You're right. Fascism has always been about more traditional and conservative values. Most of it reflects TRP's value systems as well. It was really great up until a certain Austrian gave it a bad name.

NidStyles • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 03:16 PM

I don't know either, but it's not something I can control.

banin0351 • 16 points • 16 July, 2015 06:52 AM **[recovered]**

Transgender men are just beta men that have gone too far.

unassumingusername7 • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 06:25 PM

I've been thinking recently, that maybe the less capable/respected men subconsciously understand the preferential treatment for women and opt out of manhood. They escape personal accountability, expectations of agency, and get a trophy just for showing up. There is an actual incentive for some people to switch genders now, regardless of whether or not they would want to otherwise. It's a brave new world.

RS73 • 49 points • 16 July, 2015 01:18 AM

Excellent points. This blog post overlaps with a lot of what you're saying:

<http://sultanknish.blogspot.com/2015/06/no-truce-with-left.html>

Here's most of it:

"The USSR treated homosexuality as a crime even while it was recruiting gay men as spies in the West. Cuba, the darling of the American left, hated both gays and blacks. The ACLU backed the police states of Communism. If the left supports an enemy nation, the odds are excellent that it is also a violently bigoted place that makes a KKK rally look like a hippie hangout.

To understand the left, you need to remember that it does not care about 99 percent of the things it claims to care about. Name a leftist cause and then find a Communist country that actually practiced it. Labor unions? Outlawed. Environmentalism? Chernobyl. The left fights all sorts of social and political battles not because it believes in them, but to radicalize, disrupt and take power.

The left does not care about social justice. It cares about power.

That is why no truce is possible with the left. Not on social issues. Not on any issues.

The left is a drunk in a bar trying to pick a fight with you. Trying to convince him that you didn't disrespect him, put something in his beer to make him dizzy or make his feet so heavy won't work. There's no 'agree to disagree' possible here. He's picking a fight with you because he wants a fight.

The left does not care about Bruce Jenner. It does not care about gay rights, equal pay, police brutality or even slavery. Its activists 'care' about those things a great deal right now, but they could easily be persuaded tomorrow to be outraged by telephone poles, shredded wheat or people in green sweaters.

They care mainly about emotional venting and exercising power over others. **It's the same phenomenon witnessed during the Salem Witch Trials, the French Revolution or any other mob scene. Except the individual elements of the mob are on social media and have a hashtag.**

The outraged social justice warrior was laughing at tranny jokes a few years ago. Now he's ready to kill over minor verbal missteps. A few years from now he'll be laughing at them again.

There's a long human history to such atrocities, to mobs whipping themselves up into spasms of manufactured outrage, subsuming their own doubts, confusion and unhappiness into the 'cause'.

The cause is progress, but the real cause is the power of its enforcers to vent their unhappiness and destructive impulses on everyone else under the guise of reform.

You can't find common ground with the left because it is an activist machine dedicated to destroy common ground, not only with the right, but even with its own allies on the left. Progress turns what was once progressive into what is reactionary. And what was reactionary into what is progressive.

....The left will destroy the things you care about, because you care about them. It will destroy them because that gives them power over you. It will destroy them because these things stand in the way of its power. It will destroy them because a good deal of its militant activists need things to destroy and if they can't attack you, they'll turn on the left in a frenzy of ideologically incestuous purges.

The left's social justice program is really a wave of these purges which force their own people to hurry up and conform to whatever the Party dictated this week. Examples are made out of laggards on social media to encourage the rest to stop thinking and start marching in line. As Orwell knew well, these shifts select for mindless ideological zombies while silencing critical thinkers.

Yesterday we were against fighting Hitler. Today we're for it. Retroactively, we were always at war with Oceania. Retroactively, Bruce Jenner was always a woman. Retroactively, Obama was always right about Iraq, even when he appeared to be making the wrong decisions.

These changes are a test of reason. If you can reason, you fail. If you can Doublethink, you pass.

The constant shifts create their own version of future shock. They leave people baffled and uncertain.

Society no longer seems to resemble what they knew, even though the real society of men and women has not really changed much, only the media's presentation of it has. But a beaten down mass of ordinary people now imagines that the country is filled with gay men and trannies. They accept that what they thought was common sense no longer applies and that it's someone else's country now.

And that is the prize that the left dearly wants. Surrender.

It's not about gay marriage. It's not about cakes. It's about power.

More fundamentally it's about the difference in human nature between the people who want to be left alone and those who want power over others.

You can't work out a truce with tyrants. You can give in or stand up to them. There's nothing else."

wtfomg77 • 3 points • 17 July, 2015 02:12 PM

Holy shit. Excellent comment.

The left is a drunk in a bar trying to pick a fight with you. Trying to convince him that you didn't disrespect him, put something in his beer to make him dizzy or make his feet so heavy won't work. There's no 'agree to disagree' possible here. He's picking a fight with you because he wants a fight.

The left does not care about Bruce Jenner. It does not care about gay rights, equal pay, police brutality or even slavery. Its activists 'care' about those things a great deal right now, but they could easily be persuaded tomorrow to be outraged by telephone poles, shredded wheat or people in green sweaters.

That perfectly sums it up. Today's SJW's take that in the form of expanding of what constitutes as a victim. 10 years ago, no one would think a college educated, rich white girl in American suburbia would ever think of herself as a victim in a society that was actively oppressing her. Today, her oppression is pretty much on par with a starving orphaned African child in a war torn country.

Being a victim and being oppressed is an implicit badge of honor. The goalposts for victimhood are constantly expanding. It's a form of manipulation that allows them to yield more control over whoever they designate as their oppressors.

totorox • 2 points • 21 July, 2015 01:28 PM

<http://sultanknish.blogspot.com/2015/06/no-truce-with-left.html>

That's an amazing article, thank you. I've already spread it a bunch of times on twatter and elsewhere.

Down_A_Dirty_Road • 4 points • 15 July, 2015 10:17 PM

Very interesting and I agree. It would seem that the political correctness movement has cemented the fact that at this point the most likely group to overthrow established political parties will be extremists and fascists. IIRC racist fascist groups have been rising in countries in Europe most damaged by feminism, PC nonsense, and immigration. (Sweden, UK, Germany etc)

totorox • 1 point • 21 July, 2015 08:49 AM

racist fascist groups have been rising in countries in Europe most damaged by feminism

But they're phoney parties, as I assume it's the parties you're referring to. They're controlled opposition designed to neutralize nationalism under the guise of upholding it. Nationalism in Europe is a big No now that the world elites are using Europe as a role model for globalization. They know that if they

let go of Europe their whole world gov project would be set back.

87GNX • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 03:29 PM

If all these feminist excesses are society-wide shit tests, then a charismatic fascist dictator is the alpha that will put society in its place.

Would be that it didn't have to come to this.

unassumingusername7 • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 06:28 PM

Very interesting observation. We can't know how things will go, but this is a definite possibility. We all know that only a sociopath would be able to pull this off, and that a sociopath cannot be a benevolent dictator.

Rollo-Tomassi • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 05:28 PM

The Feminine Reality: <http://therationalmale.com/2011/12/20/the-feminine-reality/>

Everything a man experiences, every social conditioning he receives from the earliest age, every accepted social norm and every expectation of him to qualify as the definition of a mature adult Man in contemporary society is designed to serve the female imperative. Moralists wallow in it, absolutists and defeated white knights existentially depend upon it, and even the better part of relativists still (often unwittingly) feed and serve the feminine purpose. In fact, so all encompassing is this reality that we define our masculinity in the terms of how well we can accommodate that feminine influence.

Our media celebrates it, and brooks no dissent. There is very little dissent, since to peel back the veneer is to be at odds with a reality defined by the female purpose. You feel lonely because you can't understand its influence, and the conditioning you've been subjected to defines the objective solution to curing that feeling. You base the decisions of your future, your education, your career, your religious beliefs, even where you'll choose to live, to better accommodate the feminine influence either in the present or in preparation of accommodating it in the future.

You get married, out of fear for not being found acceptable of it, or from social shame for not yet having accepted your role in service to the imperative. Your children are offered in tribute to it, while in turn you unknowingly perpetuate it in them. You pay tribute in alimony, in divorce proceedings, in the expected sacrifices your career demands to maintain its influence in your own life and in society at large. You exist to facilitate a feminine reality.

We can excuse it with moralisms, we can attach notions of honor and stability to it, we can even convince ourselves that the feminine imperative is OUR own imperative, but regardless, men still serve it.

dr_warlock • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 08:08 PM*

The matrix is everywhere and deeply ingrained in people's minds. I remember one of your posts talked about a man with alzheimer's that still acted bluepill on his death bed despite never succeeding with his old ways. Not even amnesia can erase the ideological disease.

I have a future post coming about how whiteknighting once had a very legitimate purpose and how the invention of agriculture forever changed intergender dynamics, eventually rendering serving the female imperative nonsense. It was the root cause to all intergender relational problems we're experiencing today. My inspiration was from one of my previous comments, here. You could call it a 'sneak peak'.

MikePatton-yakyakyak • 3 points • 15 July, 2015 09:36 PM

Ellen Pao was a scapegoat. I have no love for her but the other admins were the ones pulling the strings all along. Also, this fucking doublespeak. "free speech is awesome BUT....." The admins are now backtracking, saying that Reddit was never supposed to be a free speech bastion yet the founders all explicitly said otherwise. Anyway...I got the popcorn out. The SJWs will eat their own.

6030747 • 12 points • 16 July, 2015 07:53 AM

Feminism is founded on dogma because it can't stand to scrutiny. Never question, blindly obey

You realize this applies to traditional Christianity too? Something that you guys admire for its morals and aversion to feminism?

dr_warlock • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 07:44 PM*

We mention religion as a means to show how even our ancient ancestors knew of basic intergender dynamics if only on an instinctive level. That they used dogma to support those notions is irrelevant.

MajorRalph • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 08:35 AM

Take a look at traditional apologetics. The idea is to question your own beliefs in order to build up a defense for the faith.

OlanValesco • 3 points • 17 July, 2015 01:01 AM

You make many good points, but

It requires indoctrination to sustain itself.

is not an argument against anything (I assume that's what you were going for). All languages and writing systems require indoctrination to sustain themselves. All branches of the STEM fields require indoctrination to sustain themselves. There are very few things outside of breathing, eating, sleeping, mating, and so forth that don't have similar requirements. It would be foolish to discourage something solely on the grounds of inculcation (though you gave many other grounds!).

Eleshcomment score below threshold • -39 points • 15 July, 2015 08:43 PM

Because women are inferior

Can we draw the line here? Those who need to feel superior have a flaw in their own self-esteem.

Feminism is a self-fulfilling prophecy, that much is obvious. Both genders have virtually identical IQ distribution, intelligence is the most important human attribute. Our physical differences complement each other. Both genders need productive work to actualize self-esteem. Let's push to recognize behavioural differences that doesn't lead to an egalitarian social model that is crippled by affirmative action.

[deleted] • 22 points • 15 July, 2015 08:56 PM

I don't agree that women need productive work to actualize self esteem at all. The vast majority of women are happiest when they marry a good man and raise kids. Those who never do usually have problems.

A problem with feminism is it brainwashes women that they don't need a family during the years that they should be actively trying to build one. Once they get older and their biological clock has ticked away they realize the emptiness in their lives and are filled with hatred, bitterness and regret.

RS73 • 13 points • 16 July, 2015 01:02 AM

A problem with feminism is it brainwashes women that they don't need a family during the years that they should be actively trying to build one. Once they get older and their biological clock has ticked away they realize the emptiness in their lives and are filled with hatred, bitterness and regret.

That is so true. It's the social tweak that's caused more personal and societal misery and disruption than anything else.

totorox • 1 point • 21 July, 2015 01:29 PM

they realize the emptiness in their lives

And in their assets and revenues. Especially that.

trphardmode • 12 points • 16 July, 2015 12:45 AM

Both genders have virtually identical IQ distribution

I think you meant virtually identical IQ average, the distribution is much more varied for men (for IQ and nearly everything else) with more men at both the top end and bottom end of the bell curve. I suspect this has something to do with X-linked recessive traits which can be beneficial as well as detrimental.

Demonspawn • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 02:44 AM

I suspect this has something to do with X-linked recessive traits which can be beneficial as well as detrimental.

There's two theories: Y mutation and X checksum. Y mutation should be obvious. X checksum is that the X chromosome can contain genes which prevent "out of bounds" expression from genes on the other chromosomes. Of course, women have two X while men only have one.

X checksum got a boost recently, as they did find genes on the X chromosome which were not stopped by X inactivation.

Elesh • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 12:48 AM

Thanks, that's exactly what I was getting at. Men have more outliers in either directions. That helps explain why the majority of paradigm changers are men. Women don't need as much risk in their intellectual abilities and they can have a smaller standard deviation.

Demonspawn • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 02:44 AM

Mother nature was too smart to waste reproductive potential on environment testing.

dr_warlock • 45 points • 15 July, 2015 08:57 PM*

Can we draw the line here?

No. Stop tone policing.

Women are inferior physically (watch bottom four videos of Gender Equality Narrative section), mentally and emotionally. Women, as linked in the previous sentence, and confirmed by everyday experience, are mentally ill upon birth to navigate the sexual market place without achieving cognitive dissonance. There's no other way to put it. If men had the mindset as described above, they would be

deemed crazy. Dont sugar coat it with the word 'differences'.

Most importantly, they want to be inferior. You do not tell them this, you treat them like that. You just 'get it'. Being better than a woman is not something to take pride in, this is expected of you.

poopie420 • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 09:20 PM

Couldn't have said it better myself!

BobNelsonUSA1939 • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 06:19 PM

As a man who came of age in the 1950's, I am ecstatic to have found some like minded fellows. I feel like I have finally found a subreddit to my liking.

NidStyles • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 03:58 AM

Virtually identical does mean identical. Males have a wider dispersion, which means more intelligence near the top, and a greater number of higher intelligence bearing members.

The differences are far greater than you seem to want to acknowledge.

Elesh • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 11:14 AM

That also means that there are more males near the bottom. Both cases have outliers, women have a smaller standard deviation, which could be explained by not needing risk in that attribute distribution. This also accounts for the majority of paradigm shifters still remaining men.

The over large populations the difference should not be a claim of superiority. The mean is the same! There are the same number of men and women above and below average intelligence.

I think intelligence is the most important human attribute. We evolved into being a tool and language using species. IQ while imperfect does give a very strong indicator of life and health outcomes.

NidStyles • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 12:06 PM

Doesn't matter, there are more males with higher IQ, and that IQ is that much higher.

Means do not matter when it comes to intelligence. Crowds do not push innovation and technology, only intelligent individuals do. IQ is meaningless, and I could give many examples of brilliant people that died and lived in poverty.

totorox • 1 point • 21 July, 2015 01:41 PM

Doesn't matter, there are more males with higher IQ, and that IQ is that much higher.

This. A larger male spread on their IQ curve means that the higher you get, the less women there are compared to men. For example (this is a made up figure but still within realistic parameters), 10 men for one woman above 140 IQ.

Elesh • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 01:27 PM*

I would argue that the mean does matter to society. Technology has shaped history, often in ways the inventor did not intend. The impacts of the internet alone can demonstrate this. One example is the Arab revolutions being organized and promoted over social media. Technology impacts requires it's users ingenuity in economic environments just as much as the inventors.

I think the case you can make about male intelligence is that the alpha male will be superior.

This is a conclusion I'm more willing to are with, and goes against contemporary feminist/egalitarian theory. Men in aggregate are not superior than women in the aggregate. The low IQ outliers for men are a problem. They are the criminals and economic leaches in society. How do you deal with that group beyond describing them as evolutionarily disposable?

Either way you sparked a much better debate than warlock the bro-sociologist.

NidStyles • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 02:16 PM

The "Arab revolutions" were not started with social media. The documents show that there were intelligence agencies involved there.

Alphas are not the intelligence bearers of any given society, nor are they intellectually superior on any meaningful basis. Intelligence distribution is related to other conditions, of which only some of them are genetic. Men will always be superior to women when it comes to survival. So, no you are incorrect in your assessment. Intelligence can mean a better chance of survival.

totorox • 2 points • 21 July, 2015 01:41 PM

The "Arab revolutions" were not started with social media. The documents show that there were intelligence agencies involved there.

Thx. I'm tired with reading that propaganda.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 03:00 AM*

That is most definitely where I draw the line. As you stated, women are physically weaker but on the same level when it comes to IQ. This is nearly indisputable as it shows in studies and the basic fact that women are excelling at education and industry. It is nothing more than /u/dr_warlock pushing an ideology as demonstrated by the fact that he uses TRP posts as if that's supposed to prove anything.

What of the female scientists like Marie Curie or Hypatia? What of female philosophers like Ayn Rand? Female authors like J.K. Rowling or Jane Austen?

Personally, I'm for utilizing everyone's minds to their greatest potential and giving every human the liberty to do so. It's not tone policing, it's just calling out bullshit when you see it.

NidStyles • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 04:00 AM

Incorrect, they are not the same intelligence wise either.

[deleted] • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 05:07 AM

No there is not.

"The differences between IQ of men and women are small in magnitude and inconsistent in direction."

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sex_differences_in_intelligence

NidStyles • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 06:16 AM

Oh fuck me, I must be wrong, because Wikipedia says so.

Yes, that was mockery of your lame excuse as hamstering the finding of the studies done on the subject. a three percent margin of variance in max IQ in a population of billions is

massive.

[deleted] • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 10:05 AM

It's better than a TRP post.

Is it a big difference? I'm no expert but I've always understood 3% difference to be within the margin of error. Is that not the case here?

NidStyles • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 12:08 PM

In who's mind? Yours? That is meaningless, because you think Wikipedia is a valid and credible source.

3% is HUGE, do the math it's on the order of tens of millions of people with abnormally high intelligence.

I'd like see some of you idiot critics comes with half of the shit that get's posted of quality in TRP. The amount of raw research and analysis work in the sidebar alone crushes most other subs.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 07:34 PM

In case you didn't realize there are many citations at the bottom of that Wiki page to many studies done on the subject. That's much more than TRP can say.

Again, you can interpret it any way you like but it explicitly states:

"The differences between IQ in men and women are small and inconsistent."

So get that through your thick head. There's no good evidence to claim that men are by and large superior in intellect to women.

NidStyles • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 04:16 AM

Yews, and those citations are selected quite thoroughly, I am sure of it.

So you are taking someone's opinion about the differences as a matter of fact.

Yeah... You are obviously on the lower end of the bell.

Elesh • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 11:37 AM

The best is his link proving mental and emotional inferiority. Nothing more than bro-psychology. This theory is self-insular. You can't prove it wrong, so where is the value?

The hard-line dogma is not to anyone's benefit. This sub has a lot of potential and is on to something, but why feel the need to be superior? It's a sign of bitterness and low self-esteem.

totorox • 2 points • 21 July, 2015 01:38 PM*

why feel the need to be superior?

You're strawmanning and adhom-ing. You used a typical shaming tactic that females use in debate. It's not about what anyone feels here. He came up with a claim then attempted to prove it. Discuss the claim, rebuke the evidence or offer counter evidence, but if you start talking about the guy's feelings instead you're proving him right.

It's a sign of bitterness and low self-esteem.

Regardless of what you think or feel about what you assume some people's feelings to be, the

question remains: are women inferior or not, and if so at what, how and why?

It is at the very least debatable. By refusing to even consider the point but instead focusing on strawmanning the messenger's feelings, you're just making the elephant in the room even bigger.

[deleted] • -19 points • 15 July, 2015 08:59 PM

[permanently deleted]

dr_warlock • 23 points • 15 July, 2015 09:02 PM*

Read my response to /u/Elesh's response of the same comment. I will also make a post in the future.

Women have only 'conquered' because **men** let them. **Men with guns** enforce and subsidize the female imperative by artificially uplifting women.

trphardmode • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 12:52 AM

Usually conquerors reap the rewards. Women have conquered men in the same way that latinos are conquering America - they are the shock troops of the elite and won't see any of the reward for their efforts.

dr_warlock • 14 points • 16 July, 2015 01:24 AM

Useful idiots.

The darkenlightenment sub has an article about how Obama is forcing wealthy whites to integrate 'minorities' into their neighborhoods in the name of diversity. Diversity = anti-white. I live in the most culturally diverse state in America, and the colleges give out 'diversity' awards to the school board members. There was a school portfolio photo taken to represent the school, a white kid was taken out without given any reason, despite not being unattractive. Hint: I was sitting close by, eavesdropping when it happened. This 'diversity' is an agenda by the government for sure.

NidStyles • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 04:01 AM

This has to do with everyone in government being a feminist.

dr_warlock • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 04:57 AM*

Just like religion (especially Christianity in Ancient Rome), extreme leftism (including feminism) was resisted, but the ideology spread so much that the government realizes that it's easier just to join the bandwagon and 'adopt' the mainstream beliefs to appeal to the populace solely for political gain. Then there are people in government who delusionally believe in the cause. We call these people useful idiots.

NidStyles • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 06:17 AM

Whether they are true believers or not does not matter. If they bear the title of it, they are in support of it for their own ends and are obviously not friendly to me.

[deleted] • 0 points • 15 July, 2015 09:31 PM

[permanently deleted]

PetrolFlavored • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 12:07 AM

I believe female power rose in modern times only because male power degraded.

dr_warlock • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 01:48 AM

Watch this video from my video compilation post

What Patriarchy is, and Why it Comes to Be

Big picture video related to the book, *The Fate of Empires*. The cycle of patriarchy and gynocracy repeats throughout history depending on the proportion of men and women.

vengefully_yours • 100 points • 15 July, 2015 05:45 PM

No, we will not be toning down our language, stifling the anger, or shaming the hate, it is unhealthy to do that for men.

Anger is useful, it can be just and the correct emotional response. It is maligned because people can utilize it very effectively, and it can be scary. Oooh scary brute is angry, lets all shame him. Few learn to control and thus wield their anger effectively, because they're told it's bad, does more harm than good, and only hurts the one who is angry. Thats some feminine thinking right there. All shaming and supposed moral high ground bullshit.

Fuck no I won't be holding my anger in, I was forced to do that when I was a kid and it built up inside me and would explode without warning. I had plenty to be angry about growing up, beatings every day, being told I was worthless by nearly everyone from parents, siblings, and teachers, and worse. My anger was a raging fury when I was 16, and I was physically strong enough to become quite dangerous. Being forced to hold it in created a very unstable situation, I broke noses, arms, ribs, knocked my dad out cold, and nearly killed my abusive older brother multiple times, only holding back to prevent my life from continuing in a prison cell.

30 years later I have control of it, but it cost me dearly getting control of it. I was forced to comply with the feminine imperative and it nearly destroyed me and others. The way it's going now, there will be even more violent kids and young men, because they've been lied to, and told to repress that most basic emotion and when it comes out, it is epic.

Pacification only works on a few, there will always be resistance, and the outliers on the other side of the curve will be your killers, revolution leaders, and monsters. Repression of anger doesn't work, you must embrace it and learn to wield it. By trying to make strong willed boys into weak willed girls on the mental and emotional level, the most violent and uncontrollable are created, and they inherently have the physical strength, willpower, and mental ability to do enormous harm. It's far better to have them in control of their anger, than to push it deep down and hide it.

PetrolFlavored • 38 points • 15 July, 2015 06:59 PM

"Evil is a word used by the ignorant and the weak. The dark side is about survival. It's about unleashing your inner power. It glorifies the strength of the individual."

[deleted] • 16 points • 15 July, 2015 07:33 PM

18yo ex-male feminist new to trp here. Pretty sure I fall into the "repressed anger" category. Any suggestions for developing a healthier/more mature method of wielding anger? (I have literally zero alpha male role models in my life).

[deleted] • 17 points • 15 July, 2015 09:16 PM

Highly recommend exercise and meditation. The exercise should leave you too tired to use that anger in any other way than a productive one, and the meditation will leave you too at peace to really give a fuck about it.

Ultimately you want that anger to become pure energy - a driving force in you to take action. This is learning to wield anger without cutting yourself with it. After you've learned to do that, you just need to

set goals (see the sidebar) and you'll have the roadmap to guide your new motivation with.

howaldmg • 12 points • 15 July, 2015 08:21 PM

It boils down to redirecting anger from destructive tendencies to constructive tendencies. Lifting heavy weights makes you stronger. Running fast keeps you mobile. Reading learning materials makes you more useful...

When I find myself boiling over with rage about my situation or something I can control, I use that frustration to remove the frustrating element.

When you're angry about something you can't control, take it as an opportunity to grow internally. The emotion of anger is a survival trait. It creates the drive to fix a situation. When the anger cannot be harnessed for change, it needs to be let off in healthy ways like self improvement. Realizing how pointless it is to be angry at something you have no control over is something that gets easier with time. You also get better at determining how much control you really have in various situations.

vengefully_yours • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 12:18 AM

Don't be afraid of anger, but realize what is making you pissed off. Is it legitimate? Or is it some moronic halfwit simply being as stupid as stupid is? You have a choice before you get mad, ask yourself if it's worth getting mad about before you let it go. In other words don't sweat the petty bullshit.

Next learn to control it as it runs, restrain the violence in situations where it's unwarranted to injure others, but get mad nonetheless. No need to make shit worse than it is, but if it's justified anger roll with it and let it run its course.

Let go of it as quickly as it came, no need to dwell on it and be pissed off for hours or days. Get shit done, then move on to the more important shit.

I have ptsd so this is extremely difficult for me, lots of shit triggers my fight response, I really don't have a flight response, so I am in it for the duration if I get going. I have to remember that the people around me aren't trying to kill me, and usually it's not their fault, like trying to get my cell phone issue resolved a few days ago. The people working there had nothing to do with the computer shit, and I tried not to take it out on them. Still I was pissed, at equipment and people on the phone supposedly there for tech.

Now someone takes a swing at me/is a legitimate threat to me/others, or vandalizes my car I just finished, yes they will be meeting the other side of me, and they won't like it. If I am dead calm and not moving much, I am past anger and into something else. Bad shit happens when I am like that. That happens when someone actually tries to kill or severely harm me.

Tldr. You have a choice to get mad about little shit, don't bother if it won't affect the outcome, or if it will make shit worse. Dont get violent unless warranted. Let it go easily after it's usefulness has subsided.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:43 AM*

This is actually really helpful. I get way more worked up over stupid meaningless shit like internet comments than I should. This actually puts my mind at peace quite a bit. Perhaps I just need a little more perspective...

EDIT: Given what you've said though, one other thing: do you think the army and/or air force or whatever branch you were in are good places for a guy who's never really had any masculine instruction in his life to get a sense of masculinity? I've read varying opinions on this, but it sounds like you've seen/been through some pretty awful shit, so you'd probably have a strong opinion...

vengefully_yours • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 03:54 PM

The USAF doesn't like alpha males who aren't tall and thin, if you're muscular you'll constantly be derided for it. The AF is full of make work busy body bullshit, very political, and competence with hard work gets you depended upon and thus overworked. So many incompetent ass lickens there, getting shit done secretly stands out. You don't get awards or recognition, but you run as much as you possibly can...especially when you're a over muscled tank like me. I should have been a marine carrying a belt fed spray machine.

If you decide you're going to be a high speed low drag type who overachieves, AF, Army, and Navy are good places to go somewhere. Marines are their own little world, max pt, don't be a stupid dirtbag, and apply yourself and you'll have no choice but to become a man. Puss out and they're unforgiving. Some great friends are jarheads, but damn they're different from the rest of us.

NidStyles • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 04:08 AM

I find that if I eat more often the anger is less severe. Strange as it sounds, but I get very angry when I am hungry. Some say it's unhealthy, but as a survival trait, I think a lot of the time diet is important in containing the animal instincts.

Obviously lifting is important in burning off that energy.

dr_warlock • 6 points • 15 July, 2015 10:13 PM

The psychology of whiteknights, manginas, and male feminists.

SullenBarLurker • 3 points • 15 July, 2015 06:53 PM

This describes my younger life to a T. Glad I have a better grasp of how to use my anger now. Thanks in large part to this sub.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 11:17 AM

Even if anger wasn't useful I'd defend it. It's there, not gonna go away just because you tell it to, might as well embrace it. If it causes a man to be self destructive then curing the anger's a last resort for me after it's become clear that the self destruction won't stop any other way.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 03:59 PM

Anger doesn't cause self destruction, that is already there and anger simply shows it in a more vibrant light.

gwankovera • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 08:48 PM

This on anger and violence is very true, those who do not allow it out, deny it exists say it is something that can be done away with are the same ones who are the most violent at protests. By denying a part of yourself you you are condensing it and making it into a time bomb that is counting down.

through_a_ways • 19 points • 15 July, 2015 08:50 PM

"The feminine imperative"

You mean physical neoteny. Women physically resemble children/babies more than men do. Therefore we innately feel protection and sympathy over them. We also feel these emotions toward children.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E2%80%9CWomen_are_wonderful%E2%80%9D_effect

redpillschool[S] • 9 points • 15 July, 2015 09:59 PM

physical neoteny

Thanks for this, I'm going to look into this. Cheers.

[deleted] • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 02:12 PM

Physical neoteny explains why I'm so attracted to Asian women.

[deleted] • -3 points • 15 July, 2015 11:15 PM

"Another experiment found adults' attitudes were measured based on their reactions to categories associated with sexual relations. It revealed that among the more sexually experienced men, the more positive their attitude was toward sex, the greater the positive implicit bias towards women."

This right here is quite... blue pill.

Subtleterious • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 02:15 AM

If you get laid on the regular you have less anger towards women. That is basic common sense.

redditor1618 • 44 points • 15 July, 2015 07:21 PM **[recovered]**

Reddit co-founder Alexis Ohanian calls himself a feminist. What a pathetic clown. I will never respect a man who labels himself a feminist.

usul1628 • 34 points • 15 July, 2015 09:00 PM

There was a guy in college who my best friend and I could never really describe why we disliked him so much. Then he won "Man of the Year" from our college's feminist groups. From there forward we could always explain our dislike for him succinctly. He's the kind of guy who feminists would give an award to.

dr_warlock • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 08:56 PM

Men instinctively despise manginas.

Rashid-Malik • 1 point • 18 July, 2015 03:53 AM

Only when they wake up to the realization of what all this feminism hoopla is about. Many 'men' were 'menginas' once but they they woke up and out of the spell. We support memes that resemble ours and oppose those that are contrary to ours, at that certain point in time. But opposing memes have the capability of winning us over to their side of fence; and then, what we found compatible and likable becomes despicable. It is a matter of focus, where our mental telescope is focused, during which period of our lives.

bicepsblastingstud • 9 points • 15 July, 2015 09:22 PM

From the link you posted:

Something that people don't know, is that 'a feminist' means someone who wants equal rights," he says matter-of-factly. "I think you would have hard time finding anyone who doesn't believe in equality.

And I'm apt to believe him.

We left at an impasse and I had no wherewithal to argue with the likeable Ohanian, especially on a Friday night in my growing tequila haze.

He made a smart social play, disarmed the girl who brought it up, and carried on with his night.

Just something to consider.

systemshock869 • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 04:59 PM*

With a bullshit excuse of a definition of Feminism. I've had that spouted off to me before. It means nothing. Of course everyone believes in equal rights. In the west, women already do have equal rights, if not superior rights. What they are after is neutralizing the inherent advantages that men have while preserving and leveraging their own. This is just rhetoric that Feminists regurgitate to deflect any criticism that comes their way, not some 'smart social play,' though the context in this case was a little out of the norm.

And you didn't include what was said right before that:

Ohanian looked taken aback and said "I'm a feminist, too".

This is what I like to call cognitive dissonance. **How can man whose website is notoriously anti-woman be a feminist?**

What a complete idiot. "[His] website." Like he controls the content on Reddit. Not to mention it's fucking Reddit, of which all the mainstream subs are actually PC policed. Now, with the official purging of feelz-hurting subs, they've even stepped the Femminazi up a notch. Supposing her retarded logic is sound, she's still completely wrong.

"Cognitive dissonance" - don't hurt yourself sweetheart.

balalasaurus • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 01:30 AM

I always say I'm a feminist when talking to women...then get them to admit that men and women are not equal. Try it some time. It's a lot of fun.

MattyAnon • 10 points • 16 July, 2015 05:29 AM

I've had a lot of fun with "I'm a feminist - I believe women should work for a living, pay half of everything, ask men out on dates, while I sit at home and load the washing machine once a day".

IllimitableMan • 60 points • 15 July, 2015 05:58 PM*

This is a brilliant, concise and succinct post RPS. Kudos. Bravo.

So they tone police and frame it as morality, but make no mistake the end goal is to prevent discussion from happening that does not conform to the feminine imperative. Because the very discussion is a threat. Knowledge is a threat.

The irony is, hypergamy and female sexual plurality (AF/BB) is not moral in the slightest, in fact, it's ruthless utilitarianism can be damn right immoral. It's more a case of "do as I say, not as I do" with women/the feminine imperative. What's good for them, is not good for you. They police our freedom so they can enjoy theirs. They even go so far to say that clueless nice guys are immoral, as they berate and exploit such men. I mean seriously, what the fuck? How perverse can you get with that shit. Nice guys are just idiots, they are not immoral for trying to "kindness their way into sex" at all. They don't know a better strategy. It's pretty naive and innocent in my view.

You know what you'll never catch me doing? Denouncing the anger, the fringe, or any of the extreme elements of The Red Pill. You know why? Because it serves absolutely no purpose but to appease the feminine imperative. And once that sneaky little bitch gets her foot in the door, that's when the race to the bottom begins.

Word. I am of the same view. I tire of the guys who immediately invalidate something because it was said angrily. Some of the realest shit you will ever hear a man speak will be said with a tone of righteous anger. If you don't like anger, why do you like Patrice O'Neal? Exactly.

SunShoe882 • 25 points • 15 July, 2015 06:24 PM

Delicious, isn't it? When anger invalidate your claim, you have to wonder why we have people like Mattress Girl who make videos featuring violent sex video to provide some obtuse point. Meanwhile, the men who wonder why they must be silent and shamed are told to be less angry, be more respectful to women. I know that I'm going over point that has been covered to exhaustion, however the absurdity of it all must be acknowledged.

Also, challenging a person's angry tone is generally what you do to a child or a someone who is far beneath you.

[deleted] • 8 points • 16 July, 2015 12:33 AM

Women are no more moral then men, and Id say typically much less moral. Thats why they commit more dv, rape, and child molestation than men. Other than severe psychopaths, women are about as traditionally immoral as it gets. Now maybe traditional morality is a flawed concept, but I digress.

[deleted] • 13 points • 15 July, 2015 07:24 PM

"Anger is a very important—anger is an emotion without which the human species couldn't do."

"For a lot of people, their first love is what they'll always remember. For me it's always been the first hate, and I think that hatred, though it provides often rather junky energy, is a terrific way of getting you out of bed in the morning and keeping you going. If you don't let it get out of hand, it can be canalized into writing. In this country where people love to be nonjudgmental when they can be, which translates as, on the whole, lenient, there are an awful lot of bubble reputations floating around that one wouldn't be doing one's job if one didn't itch to prick."

-Hitch

gekkozorz • 21 points • 15 July, 2015 08:02 PM

Interestingly enough, the administrators at Reddit may very well be unknowing pawns in this battle. Because we know the feminine imperative frames itself socially as morality, the admin and CEO aren't necessarily making moves because advertisers are actually putting pressure on them, but instead they believe they are making moves because they are moral and right, and that if the feminine imperative is to be believed, the business and advertisers will be quick to jump on board. Because it is right.

Hahaha, anyone remember this gem?

"Gamers don't have to be your audience. Gamers are DEAD!"

11 months ago, the games press found themselves in the awkward position of being San Fran hipster beta male feminists, taking part in a culture that is very much dominated by men in both composition and tone. And as we all know, the glorious and benevolent Feminine Imperative declares that Male Cultures are bad and need to be whittled down into female-friendly cultures. It's the "right" thing to do. It is just and moral that men be deprived of their own circles.

So the games press said fuck it, let's tell gamers to go fuck themselves.

11 months later, the GamerGate consumer revolt against the games press rages ever on.

99% of the time, people act in their own best interest. They want money, success, love, status, etc. They do what

it takes to achieve what is best for themselves.

But the FI is so compelling, many individuals and businesses have willfully blasted themselves in the foot, simply for the purpose appeasing it. Simply because, as RPS said, it is "right." Male cultures are bad. Female cultures are good. Male cultures must be femalized at all costs. I must do my part, as a willful pawn, to work towards the femalization of male cultures, even if doing so results in my own demise.

Reddit is actively sabotaging its own existence. Its admins are so slavishly devoted to the glorious FI, they are willing to tank their own website in their quest to see it fulfilled.

They don't *see it* as being self-sabotage. They think they're "upgrading" to a "better" audience. The FI has promised them that this "better" audience totally exists and is real.

usul1628 • 12 points • 15 July, 2015 09:07 PM

There are lots of people within GG who are eager to appease the feminine imperative. I'm thinking in the next 2 months there's a major crack up of the community, even if KiA survives another 24 hours.

[deleted] • 32 points • 15 July, 2015 06:34 PM

My answer to yisan

Actually I'm shocked I'm not shadowbanned yet (ah but the day is young) for daring to stand up and say *Yours is not the only truth... The continuing discussion matters...*

Gentlemen, it has been an honor to post in this sub and be recognized by my peers. Thank you everyone for hearing my stories, rants, opinions and theories on life, happiness and personal fulfillment.

Maintain your sense of self, men. Remember to dig deep for that extra strength, guile and courage in the face of adversity when you need to, **for us the only safety net exists between our ears - there is no help out there for us - we either sink or we swim**

I fully expect in the coming days this sub of 120K+ subscribers will be sanitized for the sake of the imperative. In case I don't get the privilege of sharing in here again, Godspeed and fare thee well, my friends.

(reposted with archived link)

Redpill0re • 12 points • 15 July, 2015 09:16 PM

First, Wong is obviously lying here, evident from his fake-upbeat tone and overcompensating comments such as this:

she was the only technology executive anywhere who had the chops and experience to manage a startup of this size, AND who understood what reddit was all about

(Ridiculous: Reddit's size is 71 employees, and reddit isn't exactly rocket science)

Second, the tone of your comment comes off almost like asking for sympathy. Reddit is just a tool. They can't ban your ideas. Don't get emotionally invested here. The community will soon move to the new forum-du-jour. Let them live with their delusions, until their lies stink so much they choke.

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 July, 2015 08:26 PM

Wow Yisan is so professional guys. Honestly, even if this sub dies, we won't because we are all angry fuckers and we won't take it anymore. Even if all red pill discussion is banned here we will hold this principle inside each of us. The red pill has been helping us improve ourselves and helping us sharpen our blades. I will be damned if I have to submit to the feminine imperative, in fact, I will show them what it means to be free.

RedBigMan • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 03:40 PM

If the imperative fucks TRP they'll lifeboat it over to puearchy.com

PetrolFlavored • 1 point • 15 July, 2015 08:17 PM*

"Well, now she's gone (you did it reddit!), and u\spez has the moral authority as a co-founder to move ahead with the purge. We tried to let you govern yourselves and you failed, so now The Man is going to set some Rules."

So? It's not like Reddit has a hold on some exclusive tech. It's just a forum. Voat for instance, is a viable and free alternative.

I don't understand why Reddit, which btw is a poorly monetized startup with no shortage of competition, suddenly jumped on the high horse...did I miss something?

vengefully_yours • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 12:58 AM

I don't understand why Reddit, which btw is a poorly monetized startup with no shortage of competition, suddenly jumped on the high horse...did I miss something?

Greed. Pure and simple. They want to be Zuckerberg or Gates.

StrokeGameHusky • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 02:02 AM

They are trying to make it less dark and scary for all the mainstream Facebook users. They don't want it to be a place where "nerds" talk about **anything**

They want it to be a place for **everyone** -- apparently fat people too.

It's like when your favorite band went mainstream. Sure they made more money, but they lost their message, they have no identity anymore, they sold their soul for money. Goodbye reddit.

newls • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 06:33 AM*

Particularly women. Women are a very attractive demographic for advertisers. They generally don't know what AdBlock is, they generally click on ads more, they shop and buy stuff all the time, and they're generally much more likely to share things on Facebook/Instagram with the rest of their friends.

vengefully_yours • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 02:23 AM

Well good because I am fat.. I wanna fit in, but I n33d two seats

RedPillDad • 26 points • 15 July, 2015 06:00 PM

Great post and explanation of the Feminine Imperative. Today's gynocentric frame of reference is so pervasive, the average young man lives life on his heels, defending himself.

survives and thrives off of two factors

Number 1 is women's tribal proclivity to defend "Team Women" in any situation involving another woman. How any woman is treated is symbolic of how all women are treated.

This doesn't hold true for men. We usually just ignore or laugh at that losing guy getting his ass kicked.

Regarding Men's proclivity to White Knight, I think they do it for the status and nobility (serotonin boost) rather than a direct sexual strategy. What might appear altruistic is more self-promotional.

redpillschool[S] • 31 points • 15 July, 2015 06:18 PM

This doesn't hold true for men.

In fact, guys will throw each other under the bus for a taste of that sweet sweet puss.

gekkozorz • 13 points • 15 July, 2015 08:09 PM

Women have a 4/4 in-group preference for other women, and men have a 3/4 in-group preference for women. Basically, most people prefer women to men.

Social-climbers recognize this fact and exploit it for everything it's worth.

MattyAnon • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 05:32 AM

Agree with your point, except "men have a 3/4 in-group preference for women". That should read out-group I think, because they have a preference for outside-their-own group.

This is why feminism is winning - they have all the female vote and 3/4 of the male vote.

Fucking pussies - if men only knew that women didn't respect their white knighting, we'd have a fair fight on our hands.

dr_warlock • 3 points • 15 July, 2015 10:17 PM

The psychology of whiteknights, manginas and male feminists [The actual title]

RedPillDad • 4 points • 15 July, 2015 11:28 PM

Great video. But I had to watch it twice because I was so distracted by the guys trying to punch each other's lights out.

user_none • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:58 AM

Tip, if you don't know how to download from Youtube to get the audio for distracting videos like that one.

jdownloader.org

Download, install, update, then copy the URL for the video you want to download. JDownloader will then parse the link and give you options for downloading audio and video in different resolutions.

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 July, 2015 11:54 PM

This is one of the best posts I have seen in this sub. And the comments are just as good.

purplecabbage[] • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 12:09 AM

Reddit is going to go the way digg.com went.

a-memorable-fancy • 14 points • 15 July, 2015 06:16 PM

In the 90's there was an extreme push in our culture for men to get in touch with their softer side, to embrace feelings and focus on equality and communication with women.

A man in touch with his feelings is going to be a man in touch with anger, with masculinity, and with the constant struggle that comes with playing the game. A man who's conscious and accepting of his feelings isn't going to be your modern day SJW cancer, who medicates with alcohol, stupid pop culture, and cuckold fetishism. He's going to be a man who stays physically fit, who demands respect when he deserves it and defers it when in the presence of greatness, and who understands women are women, for good and ill.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 12:46 AM

A man in touch with his feelings isn't the problem. A castrated, pussified man is the problem. Maximize your testosterone levels, focus on your self interests exclusively, and shun anything not in your own self interests, leave the herd behind.

[deleted] • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 12:54 AM

121,000 subscribers isn't enough to make a difference. People need to start spreading these RP truths further into the depths of the internet and media.

Subtleterious • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 02:20 AM

No. Blue pillers won't listen by default and you just painted a target on yourself for no gain. Think like an atheist in the Vatican.

a_chill_bro • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 03:31 AM

The feminine imperative will never be satisfied, and will continue its work until there is nothing left.

I would add that the end goal of the feminine imperative is **female supremacy**. The end goal is to establish a matriarchy where the majority of men (a.k.a. betas) are completely enslaved and sexually exploited. A beta simply is a battery to be consumed for the benefit of hypergamy. Kind of like the human fields in the matrix where people are grown and used for power by the machines.

On the other hand there will always be the few true alphas who are actually reproducing with these women. These guys will be your actors, musicians, entrepreneurs, male strippers among others. They will exist outside the matrix and be worshipped by these women. They will be able to bend all the rules and women will go absolutely crazy for them. I would argue this is already taking place.

We are going to be seeing some very interesting changes in our culture over the next few years. Hold on gentlemen.

2012Aceman • 25 points • 15 July, 2015 05:35 PM

Every time reddit cuts off what they believe to be the worst 10%, a new worst 10% is created.

This is why I hated the crusades to "take down the 1%" It's like those people weren't aware that you cannot eliminate the top 1% just like you can't eliminate the bottom 1%: there will always be a best and a worst in the world.

6footdeeponice • 9 points • 15 July, 2015 05:44 PM

The goal was never to eliminate the top 1%, it was to eliminate the people who happened to be in the top 1% at that time.

Also, it wasn't even the top 1% that was the problem, the top 0.1% are the ones that had the huge differences in wealth. Wealth just sitting around, waiting to be trickled...

2comment • 17 points • 15 July, 2015 06:47 PM

If you mean dollars, smart wealth does not sit around. It can't afford to. Inflation. It gets invested. IOW, put into communities.

It's usually the people in the bottom that waste it on dumb shit. Fancier than they need cars. Nails. Hair. Rims. Gadgets. Shit that doesn't bring anything.

I agree there is a big income disparity. But stigmatizing wealth itself is not going to get anyone

anywhere. Wealth is the American dream. Don't kill that.

2012Aceman • 24 points • 15 July, 2015 07:43 PM

Wealth is the American dream. Don't kill that.

That is exactly why they're killing it: because the American ideology cannot coexist with these Progressive ideologies. If a person truly can go out and make their own lot in the world, then what excuse does the person who doesn't want to do that have? It's better for them to believe that they are persecuted and there's no way to stop the oppression than to forge their own way and become less reliant on their oppressors. The first self-made woman millionaire was an African American in the early 1900's (Madam C J Walker). Before feminism. Before Affirmative Action. Before quotas, before redistribution, before social services, before "fairness" laws. But I bet you'll never hear about those success stories, they diminish the victim narrative.

vandaalen • 5 points • 15 July, 2015 09:48 PM*

It's usually the people in the bottom that waste it on dumb shit. Fancier than they need cars. Nails. Hair. Rims. Gadgets. Shit that doesn't bring anything.

That is literally what keeps the economy and the system going. Consumption. Endless consumption. An economy does not get strong from people having it lay around in assets, but from spending. Investment does not magically breed value. All that amount of money has to come from somewhere and in our debt based system it comes from real life values, which are produced and consumed.

vengefully_yours • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 12:54 AM

If you want to be wealthy, you must produce something, not necessarily trade hours for dollars making shit in a shop, but be the one who runs the show, makes the decisions, and puts up the risk.

NidStylescomment score below threshold • -5 points • 16 July, 2015 04:16 AM

Consumption is the destruction of wealth, not the builder of it.

Flyingbuffaloman • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:27 AM

On a purely personal level, not within the context of a capitalist macroeconomy.

NidStyles • -3 points • 16 July, 2015 06:19 AM

Macroeconomics is socialist dogma. It's part of the problem, as it ignores the individual and presumes to be able to predict the markets without outliers, which is statistically impossible. It's purely a part of the socialist "social engineering" paradigm that presumes to usurp nature and the human behavior, yet keeps failing every single time, because they don't have the "right form of socialism". It's basically an endless circle jerk of morons.

DigitallyDisrupt • -4 points • 15 July, 2015 07:49 PM

Wealth is the American dream. Don't kill that.

Spoken like someone that has it too good in life.

"The reason they call it the American Dream is because you have to be asleep to believe it." —
George Carlin

DannyDemotta • 8 points • 15 July, 2015 08:39 PM

I'm willing to bet 1000 people who has it bad in life, and made it out OK, still wouldnt convince you.

You're one of "those people": anti-logic, anti-reasoning, anti-intellectual. Its all about personal feelings, vendettas, shaming, and other bullshit.

DigitallyDisrupt • -2 points • 15 July, 2015 11:08 PM

You're one of "those people"

Yup, I'm one of those people. I run a charity.

I'm one of those people that has to listen to people like you all the time. People like you that have no fucking idea how easy you have it.

I'm one of those people that help those that need help, so you can continue looking down your nose at them to make you feel better about yourself.

You're correct, I'm one of those people. The people that care about other people.

slimcoat • 6 points • 15 July, 2015 11:35 PM

Damn their white male privileges, right?

Get the fuck out of TRP.

6footdeeponice • 0 points • 17 July, 2015 05:51 PM

Yeah, get out of here with your charity work!

Man, isn't that guy a dick? Just going around helping people.

DannyDemotta • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 12:09 AM

Yup, I'm one of those people. I run a charity.

Jared? Is that you, bro? I thought the Feds took away all your electronics?

It's hard to take anything you say seriously - because there's such a large disconnect between what this forum is (a den of conservatives and free market types), and the dumb shit you're spouting (anti-capitalist/privilege rhetoric). Everything out of your mouth may as well be a lie. It's clear you haven't even attempted to read the sidebar material and you're just hear to spread your own non-TRP brand of bullshit.

Even if the stuff you're saying is actually true - you're misplacing your contempt/disdain/anger/whatever onto the wrong people. If you wanted to tackle the obesity epidemic, you wouldn't go into a gym and start yelling at all the in-shape people saying "you don't know how good you have it" etc. So why say the dumb shit you're saying on here, to the people you're saying it to?

Go hang out in ShitRedditSays or some other sub full of shitheads who sit around and complain about shit that doesn't matter, begging for other people to act while they sit around and just complain. We're grown folks here talking about stuff that DOES matter, and approaching it from the angle of "Don't sit around and wait for change, *make it happen*".

Azzmo • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 01:48 AM

| a den of conservatives and free market types

It would be interesting to see how people identify themselves. I've gotten the impression that it's mostly moderates, with people skewing a bit to either side of the middle (admittedly most of us would be considered conservative on a certain social issue).

You think most of us are economically conservative and general social conservative? I highly doubt it.

DannyDemotta • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 02:33 AM

I think whether most people here realize it or not, they're Conservatives. Liberal ideas ("equal rights", unlimited hand-outs, a 'basic income', feels before realz, banning free speech if it's "hurtful", etc) routinely get shit all over, while Conservative ones like the Free Market, CEOs making 300x the pay of hourlies, logic/reason over feelings, TRUE Free Speech, TRUE Freedom of the Press, etc) are solidly praised.

"Moderates" don't really exist, at least Strong ones. It's almost exclusively people who waffle over everything, changing their views based on what friends/family they've been hanging out with and being influenced by lately. Those who claim to be 'True Moderates' are mostly playing a confidence game, hoping to out-argue their opponent/inquisitor not by actually demonstrating that they are Moderates, but by stalling, re-direction, ad hominem, etc until the opponent just gives up out of frustration.

Azzmo • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 03:35 AM

I'll show you how to be moderate by redistributing your examples:

+

Equal rights, basic income, Free Market (not entirely free; some regulation required obviously for pollution control etc.), logic/reason over feelings, TRUE Freedom of the Press

-

unlimited hand-outs, feels before realz, banning free speech, CEOs making 300x the pay of hourlies

There is no room for picking teams in a logical society. By doing so one, ironically, allows themselves to be controlled in a similar way to the way the FI controls. That's the thing I don't understand about TRP conservatives and the rare outspoken TRP liberal. They profess to be logical and objective and then let a political party define their views.

IMO true TRP philosophy would eschew the notions of being liberal or conservative and would seek balance on reality's terms: you need some regulation of industry, people deserve to have a fair opportunity to live a decent life, coddling the poor is silly, trying to control what people can do with their own bodies is silly, etc.

NidStyles • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 04:17 AM

George Carlin was a Feminist.

StrokeGameHusky • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 01:50 AM

Why are we down voting George carlin quotes? Possibly because it was used in the wrong context.

Fuck your excuse he has it too easy in life, it sounds like you have it to "hard" - so get the fuck up and make your life easier. Stop making bullshit excuses.

Carlin wasn't a complaining little bitch. He wasn't complaining about the American Dream. He told it like it is. The American Dream is unattainable, the American Dream is Consumerism. You can never have enough. You finally get the perfect family and house with the white picket fence.... Now you want a new car.

"The reason they call it the American Dream is because you have to be asleep to believe it."
— George Carlin

Stop victimizing yourself bc some how you think you have it harder than someone else, you don't.

RedBigMan • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 03:52 PM

I think the real societal problem is the fact that wages haven't kept pace with inflation... It used to be the poor guy would find a half decent job and bust his ass working 8-10 hours a day for 5 days a week and be able to keep things together...

In today's world the poor guy works 2-3 part-time jobs, busts his ass at all three and works 14-16 hours a day and works probably 7 days a week and still doesn't have enough money to make rent.

In the end it's a quality of life issue... if i was in the position of poor guy in todays environment then eliminating the top 1% might seem like a pretty good idea. Problem is none of these poor guys have the guts to actually lead a violent revolution not that such a thing would be easy to plan what with the CIA and NSA spying on everyone all the time.

NsaOperative001 • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 09:56 PM

Most of the people who were/are against the 1% are only talking about the ones who received their millions by gaming and rigging the system via indirectly paying off politicians who are supposed to have everyone's best interest in heart and by down right fraudulent activity. I have not seen anyone protest let's say, Dwayne Johnson for simply *being* rich. He earned his money and deserves everything he has.

2012Aceman • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 10:22 PM

But it was George Soros who was funding the Wall Street protests, didn't they realize he's the paragon of 1%?

DaphneDK • 9 points • 15 July, 2015 10:01 PM

Well it's not our CEO or our master. It's just the CEO of some company called Reddit which provides some kind of service, but which I couldn't care less about otherwise. If Reddit starts to suck then I'm not going to lift a finger to try to change it, I'm just going some place else.

redpillschool[S] • 3 points • 15 July, 2015 10:01 PM

To Puerarchy.com!

Archwinger • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 04:52 PM

This issue goes far deeper than “the feminine imperative.” It’s just plain about speech in general.

If something you type denigrates a group of people (other than middle-class white Christian males), it is automatically “hate speech.” The test for whether something is denigrating or hateful is whether or not a third-party reader/listener is offended, saddened, or feels uncomfortable.

Yesterday, racism was the boogey man. Nigger was just about the worst word you could ever say. You can swear like a sailor in front of toddlers, but you look around the room carefully and whisper when you say nigger.

Today, sex is the hot-button issue. So anything perceived as anti-woman or anti-homosexual is the new boogey man. In another 10 years, if that long, “cunt”, “slut”, “whore”, and “bitch” will be banned words – as dirty as nigger is today. Women will be mostly free and equal (even advantaged by many social programs), but will still complain about rampant sexism. Kind of like how things are today, only more extreme.

This isn’t a woman thing so much as a crazy liberal feel good thing. Everybody’s out to feel good and never be offended or uncomfortable or sad. And no matter how many anti-depressants people shove down their gullet, until we ban offensive statements on the internet (and everywhere else) by classifying it as “hate speech” or “harassment” or “abuse” or hell, even “verbal assault”, some people will always be offended and uncomfortable.

Until we have a big-ass war or major economic collapse, and people have real problems like actually being worried about dying or starving, people have too much fucking free time on their hands to fixate on stupid shit like social justice ideology.

[deleted] • 10 points • 15 July, 2015 09:08 PM

This is more than feminine imperative. This is a war on males.

Call me crazy. But top 10% of wealthy people want to own the rest of us. And you can't own a man. For man is rather going to be killed. They know it.

That's why women, transsexuals, murderers, rapists, welfare scumbag, gay guys, basically everybody have bigger rights than a masculine male.

They want to remove us, man who think, act, and stand for his beliefs.

Sjw crew and political correctness and all of today's left wing have one goal. It's called emasculation. So guys on the top can have it easier. By it I mean enslaving those who still aren't.

redpillschool[S] • 11 points • 15 July, 2015 09:59 PM

Keeping men placated with wives seemed like best way to prevent a mutiny, why would the war on men start by taking away anything they could lose? There's nothing more dangerous than a man with nothing to lose.

GayLubeOil • 12 points • 15 July, 2015 10:06 PM

I think its time that we at The Red Pill begin construction of the Misogyny Missile. Fat People Hate went out with a bang. I think we can do even better. We need to construct an archive of photoshoped Images of Reddit CEOs performing hardcore sex acts.

Yishan getting fucked by a horse.

Pao in a Bukake.

Suggestions welcome.

redpillschool[S] • 10 points • 15 July, 2015 10:07 PM

That seems like something you'd do, but actually let's try to keep the peace and play by the rules for now. Despite this, our intention was to have a red pill subreddit on reddit.com. We have a backup planned on puerarchy but I would like to avoid moving if we don't have to.

GayLubeOil • 8 points • 15 July, 2015 10:43 PM

As long as we are not banned we need to play by the rules

NidStyles • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 06:14 AM

I don't see how that does anything positive for men.

GayLubeOil • 9 points • 16 July, 2015 06:35 AM

Bringing my enemies unhappiness brings me joy and joy is positive.

NidStyles • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 06:46 AM

Having enemies is sadness and misery.

GayLubeOil • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 07:00 AM

You cant accomplish substantial anything without being hated.

NidStyles • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 07:04 AM

Having people envy me doesn't make them my enemy.

[deleted] • 6 points • 15 July, 2015 07:41 PM

The Feminine Imperative is the presumption of a feminine reality. It is a pervasive set of memes and conventions which shift the ownership of women's personal liabilities for their sexual strategy to men.

Can anyone explain it more simply? I am not a native speaker and even with the dictionnary I don't grasp the concept.

howaldmg • 6 points • 15 July, 2015 08:37 PM

Basically, he's just saying that in this society, a woman doesn't have to take personal responsibility for her decisions. Not only that but the ultimate responsibility for the consequences of a woman's behavior is put on men by society.

Murgie • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 11:59 PM

Reddit needs to make money, because they're currently operating at a loss, so they're getting rid of the subs advertisers don't like.

This is the fault of women.

GMUwhat1234 • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 02:43 AM

god fucking feminists i hate those cunts

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 12:04 AM

Bravo redpillschool. I admire your courage and integrity.

totorox • 3 points • 17 July, 2015 08:37 PM

i read just the first third but it's brilliant. I'd define TRP as an enterprise of *uncucking*.

crack_tobi • 9 points • 15 July, 2015 05:03 PM

This deserves an upvote.

Note to all: Embrace your hate (anger) and be proud of it.

IllimitableMan • 31 points • 15 July, 2015 06:00 PM

If anger is righteous, there is nothing wrong with it. It's a perfectly natural emotion for men to experience. Society/the feminine imperative denounces it, because a man too afraid to express his anger is effectively a declawed lion. He can then be manipulated and coerced by the imperative without defending against it, any move he has up his sleeve is "deemed invalid" and greater society doubles down on him for "being aggressive, violent, or unhinged" if he taps into his natural defences. So he has to learn to fight like a woman (Machiavellianism and mind games) or take it up the ass. It's akin to mental abuse.

This is why men are learning Machiavellianism and other socially acceptable ways to battle the feminine imperative. When the feminine imperative is in control of the social fabric, you have to fight it with its own weapons to beat it.

Physical violence and anger are outlawed. Shitting in someone's mind isn't. Civilization got half way there, but by checking physical violence and allowing mental violence to go unchecked, you have a paradigm that plays directly into the hands of the feminine imperative.

RatherDieStanding • 10 points • 15 July, 2015 05:43 PM

Phrased this way, it's like we're the dark side of the Force.

totorox • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 11:26 PM*

If you have a problem with the dark side of the force then you have a problem with the force.

Embrace your hate (anger) and be proud of it.

Embrace it to reconcile yourself and recover peace and love but this time resting on a sounder, more solid base.

RatherDieStanding • 1 point • 18 July, 2015 03:17 AM

Indeed. Let the fire burn brighter.

[deleted] • 6 points • 15 July, 2015 05:47 PM

Note to all: Embrace Channel your hate (anger) and be proud of it the results. I.E. Weight training, Job promotion, new skill or hobby.

Elodrian • 4 points • 15 July, 2015 06:49 PM

It gives you focus... makes you stronger.

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 July, 2015 11:44 PM

Tldr

They need to unban fatpeolehate and all the other subreddits in the name of free speech.

That is all.

jbaum303 • 4 points • 15 July, 2015 08:07 PM

You could lead an army into battle lol

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 11:47 AM

I'm guilty of trying to ostracize the fringe nutjobs that exist in this sub.

I read this article and realize my mistake. Well written, good contribution.

usul1628 • 3 points • 15 July, 2015 09:04 PM

I've been here about a year and my love has improved by leaps and bounds. If this ship sinks, I'm going down with it.

MightyYetGentle • 4 points • 15 July, 2015 10:21 PM

amen. Any other aspect of culture being censored like this i wouldn't bat an eye. But there is *clearly* an agenda being forced on this site. And the kind of guy i am doesn't fit into that pussified agenda. I would just move on to other bullshit if this were anything else other than TRP. This solidifies my need to stop being a lazy bastard and research the alternatives i have been seeing posted. This sub has changed everything for me.

Hypnot0ad • 4 points • 15 July, 2015 09:16 PM

Excellent write-up. I'd been thinking of submitting my own analysis of the situation, especially when I read Steve Huffman's comment bragging about how he discriminates against men:

"The company is growing, and we have the opportunity to improve in many areas — including the number of women in leadership positions. I am confident in our ability to recruit women at the executive level, as we have made a point to do so at Hipmunk, where more than half of the executives are women."

I'm glad I didn't waste my time, because what you wrote is so much more comprehensive than what I could muster. I've seen the puerarchy website mentioned a lot and had always thought that it was unnecessary - like a doomsday prepper's overreaction. However, the speed with which the feminist imperative is taking over reddit is astounding. Now, the former CEO, Yishan, says the site is about to be purged:

<http://www.engadget.com/2015/07/15/yishan-wong-reddit-purge/>

This may be our last day here guys! The ship is sinking..

redpillschool[S] • 5 points • 15 July, 2015 09:57 PM

I have always hoped that puerarchy was just a paranoid man's backup, but the more we get into this unfolding drama, the more I am thankful that I took the time to make the backup forum and archive our posts. It pays to be ready, and a prudent man never leaves himself with no options.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 09:21 PM

tone policing and topic policing is a race to the bottom

Welcome to the internet since the late 90s. It's so true on every level. Every forums or website or game or community that ruffles someone's feather is a victim of this.

klumb • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 10:45 PM **[recovered]**

It makes me really happy to see I'm not the only one that sees what's happening. OP did a great job of putting it into words. This should get to the front page for everyone to read. People need to be aware of what's happening. The feminine imperative is real, and it's everywhere

outraged-man • -2 points • 15 July, 2015 11:11 PM

On Reddit it has become unavoidable. The site is going the way of MySpace and Digg. Shame, it had such

great content.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:23 PM

Feminists aren't to blame for this, this is a problem on a bigger scale. Feminism is just a scam to destabilize society, and feminists/liberals are the useful idiots being used to push the agenda. This sneaky tactic is for the purpose of banning free speech, and so the government can profit from the rapid divorces.

We have the media over sexualizing women while encouraging them to be self entitled and irresponsible. Men are being told to act emascule, which leads to us getting used or emotionally assassinated when we try to pursue something more than a plate. This is why we have MGTOW and Sexodus, but these movements just prove that marriages and family in society are pretty much dead, not to mention those sad divorce statistics and unfair bias towards women in the law.

Conspo • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 07:04 PM

I really don't care about being the "underdog nice guy"... But, you see, I am young and was never cheated on, so I may change my opinion later. I also agree with most of things here, like feminism is absolute shit whose only purpose is to benefit women.

[deleted] • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 01:44 AM

The Matrix is real, it exists in the same way it does in the movie.

The agents are the white knights, every unplugged male can be your friend, your colleague, your brother, until you do something or say something that shows you've swallowed the pill, then agent Smith takes over their bodies and start shaming or even use violence against you.

This is true with religion, where the agents will kill you, with the law, where they'll throw you in jail, etc... Stay alerte and act as one of them and never show your true colors unless it serves you.

[deleted] • 1 points • 15 July, 2015 09:36 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 15 July, 2015 09:55 PM

Mind elaborating?

collidoscope • 1 point • 15 July, 2015 11:54 PM

Does TRP plan on having anyone go debate on a MSM news show? Or is the war best fought in the shadows?

Diabolo_Advocato • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 03:43 AM

The women's movement gained traction because it stood out front and played on everyone's emotions. They pointed the finger to men and said "don't rape, imagine if it was your [insert female of assumed significance]"

The red pill doesn't gain followers by a appealing to emotions that way. It stands next to the men in the crowd and says "is she really calling you a rapist, and to think of someone else while you do it"

You can not make a horse drink, just lead him to water, nor can Morpheus make neo walk through the door.

Young men will not accept the red pill unless they have a reason to. We have to let everyone know we exist, and men will join us of their own free will because they see that the world around them is fucked for some reason. This is exactly why posts about TRP banned from askreddit and other "neutral" subs.

Jimmy_Big_Nuts • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 01:02 AM

As Patrice O'neal said, it's easy not to be racist when that is the 'right thing to do' in society, it was much harder in the 1950's, when people who do 'the right thing' though racism was the 'right thing'.

Likewise, deferring to feminine values, supporting feminism and admonishing men for acting like men is 'the right thing' currently, so standing against that morality is hard. But that doesn't mean it won't all change in 50 years. Just realise that you are swimming against the crowd. Red pill was such an apt metaphor.

thegman84 • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 07:07 AM

Best summary of the feminine imperative I've ever read.

Keep up the good work, RedPillSchool.

BabyDuck4 • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 02:37 PM

Wow. that was well written. Damn I'm confused now

NevrEndr • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:06 PM

If she has no-strings-attached sex with him, she's expressing her sexuality. If he has sex with her and won't commit, he's a rapist

FTFY

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:44 PM

When I see the way things are around me, I feel that perhaps we are already too late. I don't think we can ever escape the female imperative anymore, with the amount of people who are caught up in feminist reality. White knighting, beta male orbiters; they are everywhere; it is scary. Maybe the best we can do is wait for the bubble to eventually burst; for the whole thing to collapse upon itself. Perhaps then society will abolish feminism. Or maybe not...

[deleted] • 1 points • 15 July, 2015 05:36 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 11 points • 15 July, 2015 05:36 PM

the admin and CEO aren't necessarily making moves because advertisers are actually putting pressure on them, but instead they believe they are making moves because they are moral and right, and that if the feminine imperative is to be believed, the business and advertisers will be quick to jump on board. Because it is right.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 11:16 PM

Or, ya know, Reddit could simply block certain subreddits from the r/all and frontpage without actually removing them from the site...

[deleted] • 1 points • 15 July, 2015 07:59 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 15 July, 2015 10:00 PM

Looking into it. Thanks

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 15 July, 2015 10:05 PM

Aside from the errors- the issue is that you were not logged into reddit with the right username when you did it.

Try it again, and make sure you're logged in as -rwsr-xr-x

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 10:39 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 02:37 PM*

That is not the case, I have just made an account with all of those characters in the password.

The password is salted and encrypted before being put into the database, but no changes are made to the password.

I have rerun through the testing, and the only time the header errors show up is if you try to verify but do not have access to the account. I will be fixing that issue soon- but it doesn't break the functionality of the script.

Edit: Found the issue- reddit api was sometimes returning null for username. I have caught the error and it will alert you that reddit wasn't responding and try again.

[deleted] • 1 points • 15 July, 2015 10:33 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 15 July, 2015 10:37 PM

Strange. Might be the dashes in your name. Will look into it again.

knuckelz • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 05:59 AM

Just wanted to say that I am having the EXACT same problem with my username.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 03:08 PM

It's fixed- turned out to be an error with reddit's API and nothing to do with the passwords.

Please try again now.

ECoast_Man • 1 point • 15 July, 2015 09:14 PM

You know what you'll never catch me doing? Denouncing the anger, the fringe, or any of the extreme elements of The Red Pill. You know why? Because it serves absolutely no purpose but to appease the feminine imperative. And once that sneaky little bitch gets her foot in the door, that's when the race to the bottom begins.

I think this is an excellent point because most men don't have a solid man group to vent their frustrations and desires. I think a serious problem is that the feminine imperative has infiltrated male space. It's fucking brutally hard for most men to have a solid man group anymore because there is always a mangina spy, or even worse - the feminine imperative has poisoned most men's minds in streaks.

Where is the NCO? The shop foreman? The male mentor? For most men, these are long gone. If it takes an Internet forum for men to vent safely, god help us all, but so be it.

[deleted] • 0 points • 15 July, 2015 10:37 PM

It's such bullshit. Women are allowed to have "safe spaces" and tons of spots to talk, but when men want to gather on their own they're a "boy's club" and have to be "inclusive", but of course that doesn't apply to women.

Kirkayak • 1 point • 15 July, 2015 09:22 PM

I assess morality according to whether or not there are intrinsic and significant harms that follow from a behavior (and any factors which contribute to bringing that behavior into being). The harms I consider are, firstly, harms to human persons, and secondly, harms to the overall biosphere.

To me, if a subreddit is party to creating intrinsic and significant harm, there's at least some reason to consider doing something about it (better moderation or banning).

SteakMarsala • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 02:17 AM

I am a woman and PAO is insulting. Like she can't handle a bunch of male coworkers who let loose and separate business from pleasure?

this is why she made an ass of herself. I get equal pay and equal attention and equal respect all my life bc i am assertive a female. all my life and never had a problem and never created enemies over this. i knew how to mind my own business and never mixed my party/berdoom life with work.

she is jealous and it bit her in the ass. good. she lost a great job which she earned by being a bitch.

Sareed • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 04:11 PM

So don't denounce crazy men because it's a feminist conspiracy. But make sure you post in a subreddit dedicated to getting furious at an entire gender because of a fringe.

Yeah that doesn't sound crazy at all!

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:12 PM

Can you see why we're leery of a culture that is quick to label us crazy? Why would that convince us to give up these ideas?

Sareed • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 04:17 PM

You post on an echo chamber. Trying to convince you that your ideas are going to suffer the same fate as the dinosaurs is pointless. No need to do what time will accomplish on it's own.

No I was pointing out a flaw in the logic of the OP. You can't have your cake and eat it too.

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:22 PM

Do you see irony of disagreeing with me on the very board you're calling an echo chamber? You can't have it both ways.

Or wait, what did you say? Something about cake?

Sareed • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 04:33 PM

I like it when people use the word irony because they very rarely have any concept of the word's meaning.

Yes this is an echo chamber it is designed to have one opinion shouted into a wall and have a thousand other people shout the same thing back. Any dissenting opinion even if it contributes to the discussion is downvoted. This thread is a monument to it.

You tried really hard at a "Gotcha" moment and it kinda fucked up. You may now continue to

bask in your hypocrisy.

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:41 PM

You've just disagreed three times in an echo chamber.

My echo chamber must be broken.

Sareed • -2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:56 PM

....oh God you're being literal about the phrase. Are you a robot?

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Echo_chamber_%28media%29

In media, an echo chamber is a situation in which information, ideas, or beliefs are amplified or reinforced by transmission and repetition inside an "enclosed" system, where different or competing views are censored, disallowed or otherwise underrepresented.

Check.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:59 PM

No you're wrong. And yes, I am a robot.

Sareed • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 05:07 PM

No I am right and you are a robot.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 05:10 PM

Ok I'm bored.

[deleted] • -3 points • 16 July, 2015 01:40 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 02:13 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -4 points • 15 July, 2015 06:22 PM

Watch this video to understand the WHY behind Feminist.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ssCkc8t9sho>

animalmind • -1 points • 15 July, 2015 08:24 PM

Don't be the macho asshole, be the underdog nice guy who understands your feelings. Anybody who wants to deny that would have at least two decades of movies and television shows to answer for.

Isn't this an idea, at least in movies and TV, that is perpetuated by men. Most screenwriters are men. It's a beta male fantasy.

p3ndulum • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 11:12 AM

Consider Anita Sarkeesian's assault on the game industry. She is trying to change the way developers make games.

Did you catch that? She is trying to get *other people* (mostly men) to change how they do stuff, for the benefit of herself and other women - instead of actually doing it herself.

That's how this generally works. The women complain, and the (bluepill) men comply.

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 15 July, 2015 10:00 PM

And the macho man archetype was also written by men. The culture, however, changed. And the feminine imperative is at the helm.

writewhereileftoff • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 02:40 PM

They will write what will most likely sell. It's that simple

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -6 points • 16 July, 2015 02:53 AM

Scroll till end of comment, No TL:DR;... downvote.

jobs33kercomment score below threshold • -25 points • 15 July, 2015 06:12 PM

If you actually rejected the FI and supported the "toxic discourse" model that TRP used to be about, you would have nuked the sub a long time ago or at least closed it off to new members. It's obvious to everyone but you that trp has been on the decline for a LONG TIME, and the posts here are all evidence to that fact.

This post was voted up for fucks sake, even though it reeks of blue pill nonsense: <https://archive.is/U4zqj>

TRP has become Seddit 2.0, and you, RPS, have done exactly jack shit to stop it.

redpillschool[S] • 21 points • 15 July, 2015 06:15 PM

No, I'm quite good at what I do. I get rid of people who don't add value to the sub, who rather complain and hope other people take care of problems than to pitch in and contribute. Sound like anybody you know?

Let's see your contributions, jack...

https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/2cpc6j/humanitarian_blue_piller_realizes_hes_been/

Three lines of text. That's your analysis? Son, you just made some bold claims but you don't have anything to back it up.

Get the shit out of my sub.