

Briffault's Law

March 20, 2013 | 93 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

This has been posted a few times, and comes up in comments a lot, but we've got a lot of new users here...

BRIFFAULT'S LAW:

The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no such association takes place.

There are a few corollaries I would add:

- Past benefit provided by the male does not provide for continued or future association.
- Any agreement where the male provides a current benefit in return for a promise of future association is null and void as soon as the male has provided the benefit (see corollary 1)
- A promise of future benefit has limited influence on current/future association, with the influence inversely proportionate to the length of time until the benefit will be given and directly proportionate to the degree to which the female trusts the male (which is not bloody likely).

[Full Post here](#)

Archived from [theredarchive.com](#)

Comments

[deleted] • 50 points • 21 March, 2013 12:11 AM

Always good to wake up to the reminder that I'm nothing more than my cock, wallet and fists ~

r_rships_account • 11 points • 21 March, 2013 01:31 PM

I think your wits are (or should be) a factor too.

mach11 • 10 points • 20 April, 2013 01:17 AM

thats what the wallet represents

r_rships_account • 3 points • 20 April, 2013 11:30 AM

I don't think so. I know plenty of dumb rich men whose lack of intelligence undermines their capacity to be effective men.

mach11 • 1 point • 20 April, 2013 01:15 PM

wits without wealth is like funny without cocky, it gets you nowhere.

r_rships_account • 3 points • 21 April, 2013 03:04 AM

And wealth without wits is just beta.

skippwhy[] • 5 points • 5 June, 2013 04:41 AM

Athletes. Inheritors. Actors. Musicians. Criminals.

mach11 • 0 points • 21 April, 2013 04:44 AM

wits \neq social dominance

r_rships_account • 3 points • 22 April, 2013 06:47 AM

Neither does money alone.

SequencingLife • 24 points • 20 March, 2013 11:27 PM

Legalize prostitution already.

tidux • 30 points • 20 May, 2013 03:27 AM

I think it could be useful to paint women who oppose prostitution as a vagina cartel, and demand that prostitution be legalized as part of existing anti-trust laws.

Whisper • 7 points • 20 March, 2013 10:37 PM

This is just a specific case of the definition of a relationship.

A relationship is an ongoing or repeated interaction with continuous mutual benefit.

[deleted] • 8 points • 20 March, 2013 03:38 PM

I wonder how this fits with my friend and his model gf. He's alpha as shit, that's why she's with him, but he really does not provide much otherwise. he works a minimum wage job at nearly 30.

VZPurp • 20 points • 20 March, 2013 04:28 PM

Benefit does not have to be material resources; being alpha is a marker of genetic fitness, or at least is a signal to women as such.

ReskaSedd • 9 points • 20 March, 2013 05:07 PM*

she can definitely change as well (dump him and date a provider), but she might have beta men who provide for her while she is dating a alpha male. the first one happened to me, but my fault because i went beta on her, she was dating a beta, she cheated on him with me, i got attached, so she called it off with me, why does a girl need two beta if one is providing for her and the other has nothing to offer? (me)

VZPurp • 5 points • 20 March, 2013 08:06 PM

Yes, but women are far from perfect. They often make bad decisions. It can be amusing to be in the position of power when they ditch you for some transient issue and then you come out on top shortly thereafter.

Bobsutan • 0 points • 21 March, 2013 02:29 AM

That's ultimately what I predict. She'll get knocked up, they'll fight over money, they split up, then suddenly she'll be on the hunt for a beta provider.

[deleted] • 2 points • 5 June, 2013 07:00 PM

tingles uber alles

pontifx • 1 point • 20 March, 2013 05:23 PM

Individual human value breaks down like this:

Women - emotional current(cy) Men - parsimonious current(cy)

As long as you keep a woman emotional towards you outside of the realm of poverty (where she acts out by calling the police, or blowing up some public scandal) do anything she seems to be weak against to charge her. You let her empty by getting the fuck out of her life for a while (that means all traces). Each girl has different calibrations and sensitivities but that's all that matters to them.

All men like some form of parsimony and in this use of the word I mean removing obstacles that increase the variance in the certainty that his effort will produce the desired reward.

It should be appended to briffaults law as pontifx's addendum lol

redhandman • 8 points • 20 March, 2013 08:40 PM

I found your comment difficult to parse. I rewrote it below. Please let me know if there is that of my rewrite that is not what you meant.

Human value is 'emotional' for women and 'parsimonious' for men.

While women feel [you to be high status because you provide them with an affective roller coaster, they will remain with you]. This excepts you pissing her off to the point she calls the police, or you shaming her publicly, as in a scandal. She will of course respond variously to demonstrations of your status, which you will wish to note and to respond accordingly. [If you should need to reset the frame of the relationship] you cease contact with here completely. Women respond variously, but the basic need is the same.

All men want to invest the least effort/time/energy/money toward relational rewards, or at least to have a predictable relation of effort etc. to payout.

This [gender dimorphism wrt value] should be appended to briffault's law as pontifx's addendum.

pontifx • 5 points • 20 March, 2013 09:09 PM*

Status is disregarded in this addendum, you have to understand that people who are "high status" is just how much their hamster has crystalized emotional currency towards the reality you project. Its only a measurement of latent passive potential and nothing more. Its the difference between starting a full marathon at mile 3, or at the actual start. It's *easier* but if you get used to running full marathons then it doesn't really matter.

All men would work 24/7 if they knew they would achieve and actually get a reward equal to that effort. Game, much like a betting system is merely a strategy to mortgage failure to an end point in which the goal isn't even attainable in the best conditions for your life in the first place. Its difficult to see that given how pervasive it is in life right now. Everyone has an angle and an angel. People want to believe their lives have meaning and that is the basis of fantasy. People want to run head first into it, but with permission from reality. It's a strange dichotomy that men and women both possess but men need it as a form of certainty in our lives. The basis of this fantasy is crafting a world that makes your perception of life (even if it isn't congruent with reality strangely enough) more vivid.

Thanks for taking the time to parse it.

HeadingRed • 3 points • 25 July, 2013 11:51 PM

This statement is brilliant-

"removing obstacles that increase the variance in the certainty that his effort will produce the desired reward"

I have often expressed this concept with limited results. It's a formula that has served me well. Using this concept saves time and produces results. I work in IT and often have to take exams to gain certifications. Multiple choice tests with 4-5 answers usually have 2-3 that you can toss out as being wrong right away. This raises your odds of being correct from 20-25% to 50-60%.

Quite often life works like this. You need a vehicle. You eliminate those that don't fit the bill. You narrow down your list of those that do. You then seek the best value for your dollar for what fits your needs- even if your needs are appearance or something that does not require practicality.

Many times women already know what they are going to do or want to do. They expand the scope in order to give themselves the illusion that they have applied critical thinking to the matter at hand. As the hamster winds up and the scope widens the goal becomes such a small part of the equation that it is no longer the relevant driver of the decision at hand.

Well said sir, well said.

pontifx • 1 point • 26 July, 2013 10:26 AM*

The limited results in expressing this are the obstacles presented by life to deny these rules open providence. That is why they are generally kept secret.

How could we boil this statement down to a catch phrase? It takes time. It took years for AFBB to be created. The best I have so far is "Life is about sweet 2 for 1's."

Life4Men • -2 points • 19 June, 2013 05:00 PM

Here:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V7yjsZOco0o>

Enjoy!