

[Mod] Almost 3,000 Users and a message from the moderator

March 30, 2013 | 47 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

Well folks, here we are, hours away from 3,000 users. A lot has happened during the last month. Quite a bit.

We've started making some sizable waves. We're getting a lot more attention. I've been on international radio! We've been in the news!

There's something I've noticed that's inescapable: we're doing something *right*.

There have been loud calls to censor us. There have been many tries. It's a common mantra- the one I hear over and over. "You guys are disgusting women haters." If we were simply the *joke* dissenters say we are... why are they paying so much attention to us?

It gives me great pleasure to know that those who disagree with us are going to great lengths to try to censor us. The forum trolling, the news articles, even the half-assed conversation on AskMen. It all points to one thing: Nobody has a rebuttal for TheRedPill. They have no tool in their arsenal but insults and shame. Because at the end of the day, people hate our ideas, but *can't quite pinpoint why*.

They'll squirm, they'll twist and turn, they'll feel deep anger and do everything to shut you up. But they have no real retort. They have no argument. All they can muster is to try to shame us into submission. *Not gonna work, ladies*.

I'm happy that we've been able to grow, that so many other men have seen this and now have a welcome place to share ideas. I'm also happy to provide a place to be angry, a place to discuss ideas that might not be popular, a place where you won't face the standard shaming technique of feminists.

On Moderation: How you can help!

Please remember to read the posting rules: [Here](#)

If you see any posts that appear to be trolling, I'd ask that you click the "report" button. It's not easy for the moderators to see every thread that's happening now that we're getting big- so drawing attention to it will really help.

Thanks, everybody. Keep on keeping on.

Archived from [theredarchive.com](#)

Comments

ReggieReddit • 16 points • 30 March, 2013 02:18 PM

I hope this is a good time as any to help new users understand we welcome the true nature of men and women and shouldn't feel or display any bitterness about it.

redpillschool[S] • 26 points • 30 March, 2013 02:22 PM

There's nothing wrong with becoming bitter, at least at first. I think it's a normal reaction to waking up. But if anybody really wants to grow into themselves and take control of their lives, moving past the bitterness stage will have to happen.

Whisper • 7 points • 30 March, 2013 10:28 PM*

True. But it's not always just bitterness that makes men new to the red pill say nasty things about women. It's also a certain heady joy in being finally able to criticize that which has previously been not only a sacred cow, but a sacred cow that no one could admit was a sacred cow.

Eventually we calm down and focus on the things about women that *are* true (less mature, less ambitious, more naturally submissive), and stop saying the things that aren't (horrible, vampiric bitches with no redeeming value).

ss_camaro • 1 point • 31 March, 2013 04:10 AM*

Sacred cows... are as old as the hills.

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 April, 2013 12:40 AM

Honestly, most of what the bitter guys say isn't "nasty things about women," it's the cold hard unedited truth.

Reddit2014 • 2 points • 30 March, 2013 06:23 PM

Being bitter though is like being in a ditch, hard to get out of. I prefer the james bond approach of 'oh well, can't win them all'

redpillschool[S] • 6 points • 30 March, 2013 06:38 PM

It's a personal philosophical difference, though I tend to agree with you. That said, we can't just write off men because they're bitter. It's best to understand why they're bitter and offer real-life practical options.

Reddit2014 • 2 points • 30 March, 2013 09:00 PM

Oh for sure... I just know the echo chamber is a more seductive force, and has a good chance to derail a good subreddit

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 March, 2013 07:06 PM

It's also worth noting that once a community becomes large enough the echo chamber reaches singularity. A point where the gravitational pull cannot be overcome and a continuous descent is henceforth ensured. Which is when someone starts /r/trueredpill :)

Reddit2014 • 2 points • 31 March, 2013 08:08 PM

I used to comment back during the days when the default subs were ok, it was usually about 50k on a shittily moderated sub, and 75k on highly moderated ones.
Askscience is still the exception imo

legendofpasta • 26 points • 30 March, 2013 04:47 PM

There are literally 100 times as many people here now than there were when I joined.

I am so euphoric right now, due to the raw privilege coursing through my veins. I must have oppressed at least 10 women this morning alone

thewestexit • 8 points • 30 March, 2013 07:16 PM

There is no women-hating here. If anything, it's our desire to understand women that has drawn us to The Red Pill. Ever since I set down this path about a year ago, I've lost my bitterness toward women, stopped playing the victim, and just basically manned the fuck up, and it has helped my relationships with women immensely.

Basically, we're returning to the essence that women have been attracted to for thousands of years, before the modern world threw us all off track. The girl I'm currently seeing tells me all the time how she loves that I did this, or said that, and any of these examples she gives has been me specifically applying Red Pill philosophy. This shit is real, and at the end of the day women love it, so why fight it?

ss_camaro • 0 points • 31 March, 2013 04:17 AM

This thread needs some upvotes.

DEVi4TION • 7 points • 30 March, 2013 07:46 PM

I'm here for the revolution

46xy • 9 points • 30 March, 2013 05:12 PM

You know, whilst I agree with many mantras on here, I feel like some comments are blatantly misogynistic. Some people on here are true red pillers, whilst others are in fact bitter women haters.

I will continue reading this subreddit, but hopefully its inevitable rise in popularity will not muddy the clear waters this perspective presents.

redpillschool[S] • 6 points • 30 March, 2013 05:29 PM

Some of the deeper beliefs can appear misogynistic to the uninitiated.

Like the view that women shouldn't vote.

Or the view that women don't contribute to society.

Or the view that women are just over grown teenagers.

But these don't muddy the waters, these are views that have very well thought out reasons.

Some of the guys, upon first waking up, might appear angry. And I think that's ok. Eventually most guys settle down. I don't think that's bad. I think it's good that there's a place to do that.

As far as I've seen, not much has changed since the sub started, except more participation.

Reddit2014 • 3 points • 30 March, 2013 06:24 PM

wait, what?

Since when is womens suffrage an issue for anyone in the modern age?

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 30 March, 2013 06:36 PM

I don't think anybody currently supports removing women's right to vote, but there's been significant talk about the problem of having a segment of the population who have the right to vote, but none of the responsibilities attached.

At the time the fear was that the economic burden of future policies would weigh on those in the working class (men).

Currently there's still the argument of conscription. Women were given the right to vote before some of the men who had been conscripted to die for our country.

Having as much power over the vote as women currently have, you can already see the destructive nature of the short-term thinking that has happened from the feminist movement. (liberalism, economic collapse, anti-capitalism)

Obviously the way forward isn't taking away the vote. But you can see the far reaching effects today.

I truly believe that since most women still have a hard time grasping the concept of true consequence and responsibility, they still vote with their emotion, and not with the actual well-being of the american people in mind.

Feminism and the myth of male privilege rises from a core misunderstanding of how many real life consequences and responsibilities men actually deal with.

Reddit2014 • -1 points • 30 March, 2013 09:10 PM

Well you used to need property to vote, then conscriptions, never been in prison... It's been a historically an exclusionary system to protect wealth from popular grievances...

And that argument I've seen used before to suggest that the current drop in real wages for the middle class is because of women entering the work force, creating a labour bubble. considering it's freed men from the social stratification (you will be a wage earner, now go get a baby maker and pretend that makes you happy) I never saw it as a particularly good argument

And as far as destructive forces in voting goes, I'd put my money on low information, ignorant voters, gerrymandering, and public relations to be far worse. Remember, a lot of women don't even support a feminist agenda, and prefer the nuclear household idea as well. many are career oriented (which I think counts as sharing the responsibility) which tend to vote based on economic, rather than social issues.

I'm kind of rambling, but I don't like the idea of simplifying and vilifying an entire gender based on the actions of sociopathic people on a power grab, hiding behind people with real grievances.

But at the same time, I think a man needs to keep his wits about him, and forge his own path, because it's all too easy to get caught up in the nonsense.

And maybe I'm just old enough to know better, maybe I've been sheltered from the type of person you are talking about at the end there, but the only people I've seen who act without consequence or responsibility are ones who their social network allow to. Daddies princess, suburban well off college kids etc. they act that way because no one calls them on it, so why would they? I don't want to give others a free pass on this. Not one of those groups know anyone else's situation, that's the lack of empathy, and there's been studies done in north america (I'll try to find them later) where the empathy of western civilization is the lowest it's ever been, thanks to conspicuous consumption, narcissistic advertising, baby boomer parenting by friendship, not authority; plus all kind of other issues.

I guess I just don't see those particular issues being the gender ones, but entitled ones. I'd rather

talk about the unintended consequences of the court system, child custody, lack of support systems, stigma against getting help for problems, and other male issues. Seems to be a much better thing than what you have above.

[deleted] • 6 points • 31 March, 2013 10:51 PM

I'm kind of rambiling, but I don't like the idea of simplyfying and vilifying an entire gender based on the actions of sociopathic people on a power grab, hiding behind people with real grievances.

But at the same time, I think a man needs to keep his wits about him, and forge his own path, because it's all too easy to get caught up in the nonsense.

I guess I just don't see those particular issues being the gender ones, but entitled ones. I'd rather talk about the unintended consequences of the court system, child custody, lack of support systems, stigma against getting help for problems, and other male issues. Seems to be a much better thing than what you have above.

I completely agree with you. Taking about "sexual strategy" and "intergender dynamics" is much more interesting than trying to justify a philosophy of male supremacy.

Reddit2014 • 2 points • 1 April, 2013 01:14 AM

Oh man... When I read the Mod post from yesterday, about how women were genetically incapable of being anything but enablers, and men genetically were superior, I just shook my head.

Couldn't quite narrow down the gene, and then tried to explain it as nurture, instead of nature.

But total agreement, I see tension here between pragmatic people like yourself, and angry, bitter male 'offeminists' on the other.

[deleted] • 6 points • 1 April, 2013 01:20 AM

It's actually kinda funny how the manosphere today resembles the beginnings of the feminist movement.

Back then, there were feminists who felt that men should be dwindled down to 10% of the population, and feminists that said that all heterosexual sex is rape.

Here, we have people saying that women are somehow genetically inferior, and that they produce no value to society.

The feminist movement eventually grew, and I have a feeling that the manosphere will grow and attract some more sane people who will bring some more balanced ideas into the mix.

Reddit2014 • 5 points • 1 April, 2013 01:35 AM

People being unaware of the irony kind of makes me laugh. Even pointing it out just pissed people off. Kudos to you.

feminism took until their third wave in order to be fairly egalitarian. I don't want to

wait a century for the manosphere to get their head out of their asses.

But always the way it worked I guess. the loudest, and craziest things always stand out.

[deleted] • 3 points • 31 March, 2013 07:18 PM

Or the view that women don't contribute to society.

This is easily proven incorrect by counterexample :) I think there's an inkling of truth hidden in your statement, but it's unnecessarily overgeneralized.

[deleted] • 6 points • 30 March, 2013 07:58 PM

Like the view that women shouldn't vote.

There's a difference between saying that the right to vote should be tied to having certain responsibilities, and saying that women shouldn't vote at all.

Or the view that women don't contribute to society.

The female employment rate is about 60%

Or the view that women are just over grown teenagers.

I accept that testosterone and estrogen have certain effects on human behavior (effects that *can be overturned using willpower*), but that's just a downright hasty generalization.

There's a difference between saying that many women act immature, and that the feminist movement serves to produce incentives for that immaturity, and saying that women are naturally immature.

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 30 March, 2013 09:25 PM

women are naturally immature.

I believe, due to the forces of nature and the way maturity develops (as men know it) that women are naturally immature, not as a product of feminism- but instead feminism is a product of naturally immature women.

Spend some time reading the sidebar.

Or the view that women don't contribute to society.

The female employment rate is about 60%^[1]

And still have few inventions under their belts.

There's a difference between saying that the right to vote should be tied to having certain responsibilities, and saying that women shouldn't vote at all.

The right to vote should be tied to not only the responsibilities, but the maturity that comes from having the responsibilities. Until women have the responsibilities, they will not understand the consequences of their actions, and thus make poor decisions when voting.

[deleted] • 10 points • 31 March, 2013 01:42 AM

I believe, due to the forces of nature and the way maturity develops (as men know it) that

women are naturally immature, not as a product of feminism- but instead feminism is a product of naturally immature women.

Spend some time reading the sidebar.

I read the No Ma'am blogpost. The guy makes a hasty generalization and backs it up with a single quote from a guy from 1851.

Are you honestly telling me that you think that Sheryl Sandberg, Marissa Mayer, and Meg Whitman are all immature children?

And still have few inventions under their belts.

99.999% of men don't have any inventions under their belt. Do most men not contribute to society?

The right to vote should be tied to not only the responsibilities, but the maturity that comes from having the responsibilities. Until women have the responsibilities, they will not understand the consequences of their actions, and thus make poor decisions when voting.

1. That's like saying that someone has no right to vote until they know how to read, and yet not allowing them to vote for publicly-funded education.
2. Do you want to deny the three female CEOs I mentioned above the right to vote?

I'm in school for engineering, and I'm working with two extremely intelligent women in designing and simulating a microprocessor. Are you telling me that those women are immature and shouldn't have the right to vote?

redpillschool[S] • -1 points • 1 April, 2013 07:29 PM

Are you honestly telling me that you think that Sheryl Sandberg, Marissa Mayer, and Meg Whitman are all immature children?

I'm telling you that the way male traits such as honor, integrity, and loyalty develop are through the the incentivizing motivation that is pressed upon men.

In situations that we normally consider character building, men are forced to deal with very real consequences of their actions and inactions. No such pressures are put upon women, who need do nothing more than appear hurt or upset to receive instant aid from white-knighting men.

Because of this, the attributes we typically consider to describe a mature male are ones that most women never adopt. Commonly noticed through short-term planning, lack of long-term consequential thinking, temper tantrums, lack of diversity in character (personality), and lack of traits such as integrity, loyalty, and honor. (strictly men's traits).

This is, of course, a gradient, as I think the less attractive a woman is, the more pressure is put on her to do things for herself, the more male maturity she will adopt. Thus the reason why ugly girls can make great friends.

Do I deny that there are female CEOs? No. I'm happy for them. They're the exception not the rule.

Of course, women will become more successful as pressures change- the less we assist women, the more they'll develop male traits.

Would I deny women the right to vote? Well as I established earlier, I wouldn't advocate for taking away the vote. So I'm not sure who you're arguing with. I would say that without knowing the real consequences of their vote, these female CEOs still have no idea what it's like to sign up for conscription, we could easily get ourselves voted into a war that women want fought, without participation from said women.

I think that's a dangerous prospect.

[deleted] • -1 points • 31 March, 2013 08:25 AM

Are you honestly telling me that you think that Sheryl Sandberg, Marissa Mayer, and Meg Whitman are all immature children?

implying theres no exceptions to a generally immature group of people

dat sexism

99.999% of men don't have any inventions under their belt. Do most men not contribute to society?

i believe thats an irrelevant economic problem more than anything. also, theres literally more men alive than ideas

[deleted] • 6 points • 31 March, 2013 08:32 AM

implying theres no exceptions to a generally immature group of people

I haven't seen it. Maybe you're just hanging around the wrong people.

i believe thats an irrelevant economic problem more than anything. also, theres literally more men alive than ideas

So why should we disenfranchise half of the population while "trying to fix an economic problem" for the other half of the population? Why not create economic opportunities for everyone?

[deleted] • 0 points • 31 March, 2013 08:53 AM

I haven't seen it. Maybe you're just hanging around the wrong people.

or maybe your just sheltered.

So why should we disenfranchise half of the population while "trying to fix an economic problem" for the other half of the population? Why not create economic opportunities for everyone?

wat

[deleted] • 4 points • 31 March, 2013 08:55 AM

99.999% of men haven't invented anything, and 99.9999% of women haven't invented anything. That's an extremely small difference. Why do you support disenfranchising the female population but not the male population when there's essentially a negligible difference between the two in that regard?

[deleted] • -1 points • 31 March, 2013 09:17 AM

oh.

yeah, i dont really care about that point, just pissing into the hurricane.

[deleted] • -1 points • 31 March, 2013 08:18 AM

The female employment rate is about 60%

women get hired more often because of various reasons, but competence is not always one of them

[deleted] • 6 points • 31 March, 2013 08:29 AM

So you're saying that the free market does a poor job of weeding out incompetent people?

I beg to differ; a biased perspective of things is a much more likely explanation than the idea that employers enjoy wasting trillions of dollars in labor costs by hiring women.

[deleted] • -2 points • 31 March, 2013 08:41 AM*

are you retarded, the "free market" doesnt exist, why is it even relevant here?

male bosses tend to hire unqualified women because they smell nice, the small chance of getting laid(this can apply to the boss, and it can be a motivator for other workers), eye candy, and to avoid "the sausagefest"; they are essentially a luxury item for the workplace.

female bosses tend to hire unqualified women in order to terraform the workplace to her liking.

[deleted] • 4 points • 31 March, 2013 08:53 AM

Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.

If women really were immature as you say, then despite them "smelling nice", they would actually cause long-term difficulties in the office, and the costs of hiring them would outweigh the benefits.

If female bosses really were "terraforming the workplace to their liking", then female-run businesses would go out of business quickly, which is untrue.

Also, there's plenty of evidence showing that women make better loan officers at banks than men.

[deleted] • 0 points • 31 March, 2013 09:25 AM

i dont think you understand the meaning of that word.

hence me calling them a **luxury item**

the terraforming is almost always a minority, which is given the ability to abuse the shit out of the useful majority, which is how this shit works

irrelevant

MattThePUA • 3 points • 30 March, 2013 10:13 PM

Wait, it's red pill to think that women shouldn't vote?

Not trying to troll or anything, I love this subreddit, but I haven't heard of that before. Could you please elaborate to a semi-initiated man who wants to learn more? (:

Edit: I see you explained a bit before, but I still don't really understand, to be honest. I'll do more research

and come back, I guess.

legendofpasta • 5 points • 31 March, 2013 12:20 AM

I'll make a post this week on why women shouldn't vote, I assume it will do good for a lot of readers

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 31 March, 2013 01:09 AM

Do it!

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 March, 2013 07:15 PM

Nobody should vote :)

Democracy, The God That Failed

MattThePUA • 1 point • 31 March, 2013 02:45 AM

Thank you! Please do.

soapjackal • 1 point • 31 March, 2013 07:39 AM

I haven't done the due diligence and research but there are a lot of parallels between TRP observations and anti-suffragist predictions

Whisper • 1 point • 30 March, 2013 10:44 PM

Or the view that women don't contribute to society.

Errrrr... what? Dude, women contribute to society. They contribute *people*. Society is made of people. Women make people.

They also maintain the people who make things. Or, rather, they're supposed to.

Modern first-world women may be failing at their proper contributions. But that doesn't mean that what women are for isn't important.

[deleted] • 0 points • 1 April, 2013 12:53 AM

Stating that women's major contribution to society is birthing the men that built it is weak at best. OP is trying to make the point that society and its advancements were almost entirely crafted by men, which is quite on point. Obviously women have a place in that society, but handing over the reigns to them seems like a recipe for destroying that which our ancestors built. Of course, your reaction is a perfect example of the point he was trying to make, simple truths often appear to be misogynistic.

Whisper • 1 point • 1 April, 2013 07:07 PM

I think you mistake me.

Civilization and its advancements are crafted by men. Civilization being technology, science, physical infrastructure, etc. Women do not, in any statistically significant sense, build bridges, design aircraft, or discover new technologies.

Society is composed of both men and women. Society being the social group of people living together and connected by a social contract, a common culture, bonds of trust, and so forth.

Women contribute to building social structures, but not to physical or technological ones.

This misunderstanding echoes a typical red pill problem. What constrains blue pill society from many things it could otherwise say about women is not the bounds of the truth, but the specter of

"mithogyny! Thee? THEE? It'h mithogyny! It's dithpicable!".

But since the constraints on what people say isn't truth, but "offensiveness", once we take the red pill and are willing to state offensive truths, there is no existing consensus on what that truth *is*.

We can say anything about women now, because we are no longer afraid of being called misogynists. But which things are actually true?

My objection to statements like "women are not adults", "women contribute nothing", "women never grow up", etc... is that not only does it not make any sense, but if it is taken as a universal condition of women, it lets them off the hook too easily.

If we believe that women are inherently non-contributory, it falls to us to explain how our species managed to survive as half deadwood.

If we believe that woman are inherently non-contributory, it gives the women of *our* particular society a built-in excuse for how fucked up things have gotten, and how useless *they*, in particular, are.

I think that we need to demand more of women, instead of letting them off the hook like that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 April, 2013 12:14 AM

I think you misunderstood the OP if that's the case.

46xy • 1 point • 30 March, 2013 07:09 PM

Sure. I accept seeing things as they are, but making a moral judgement over something them is something else. I believe the morality of reality is something which misses the point. Calling someone an overgrown teenager is a step further than calling them immature - I personally don't like the judgmental attitude many people have.

Do you hate a duck because it quacks? Then why hate a woman because she is emotionally driven as opposed to logically driven? Things are as they are, understanding them is enlightenment, judgment is something else.

Dont get me wrong though, I love redpill and it has opened a new world for me!

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 30 March, 2013 09:22 PM

But calling them overgrown teenagers isn't hating a duck because it quacks. It's accepting that ducks quack, and will never be swans.

[deleted] • 0 points • 1 April, 2013 12:47 AM

Calling someone an overgrown teenager is a step further than calling them immature - I personally don't like the judgmental attitude many people have.

Then why hate a woman because she is emotionally driven as opposed to logically driven?

How is saying women behave like overgrown teenagers "hating women," especially under the assumption that this claim is true. If I call a fat person fat does that mean I hate them? If I call a black person black does that mean I hate them?

This is the problem that everyone who **hates** this subreddit has, they see us saying ugly truths and assume they are meant to insult rather than explain. And there is a key difference between the two.

46xy • 0 points • 1 April, 2013 12:55 AM

Saying they behave like overgrown teenagers is fine. But I think asserting that they are overgrown teenagers is quite different. Additionally there are semantics in how you describe things.

Certain descriptive words have intrinsic associations and thus correspondent implications. I.e. calling a fat person fat is ok, but calling a fat person disgustingly obese is a different matter, even though both statements may be concordant with a perceived reality.

[deleted] • 0 points • 1 April, 2013 01:03 AM

So you're saying we should sugar coat the truth with carebear hugs and unicorn farts?

Honestly, no matter what way the truth is delivered, haters are going to equate it to misogyny.

All women are whores (they will trade sex for something in return). Please, tell me the nice way to say this.

46xy • 1 point • 1 April, 2013 11:34 AM

Im not talking about sugarcoating at all. Im talking about keeping truths and moral judgement separate.

Technically you could say all women are whores, but that has negative connotations which are not really necessary to describe the truth (i.e. the word whore is an insult) . I think this is important if you want to be taken seriously. The same way you can refer to a gay man as "faggot" but its not really necessary to describe his homosexuality.

That's not sugarcoating with carebear hugs and unicorn farts. It's just keeping pejorative words out of it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 April, 2013 12:16 AM

The word whore is an insult because women dread being thought of as whores. Should I instead say women are all prostitutes? Or all women will sell or trade sex for things they desire from men? Sure I could be nicer about it, but it doesn't change the truth. And calling women whores doesn't mean I hate them, even if they take it as an insult. I for one love whores ~

46xy • 0 points • 2 April, 2013 12:35 AM

The word whore is an insult because you can call someone a whore without literally meaning that they are a prostitute.

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 April, 2013 01:24 AM

But I do mean it literally. Women trade sex for stuff, that's what a whore is.

[deleted] • 4 points • 30 March, 2013 02:43 PM

You've helped me a lot and the results are showing. Keep up the good work guys. Enjoy life.

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 March, 2013 04:25 PM

High Diplomat RPS, may the whirring gears of Zion always bring your heart peace when the harpies screech. May the Oracle's wise words continue to keep you on the path of privilege. May your harem never dwindle under the might of the Disney fantasy. May your soul always be harmonious in the face of an unbalanced hamster. May the newly enlightened continue to flock our way out of the haze of the Blue. For this is your destiny, as proclaimed in the book of the Patriarchs, 3:16 "He who hath suffered shall not suffer alone, for

brothers lost shall find their way, and the Pill of Red shall be their salvation." So say we all!

[deleted] • 30 March, 2013 08:08 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 March, 2013 07:21 PM

Agreed. I suggest *heavy-handed* moderation to keep this sub from turning to a shitflood of hygermany+hamster examples.

rednailz • 3 points • 31 March, 2013 02:24 AM

"First they ignore you, then they laugh at you, then they fight you, then you win." Ghandi

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 April, 2013 12:57 AM

Sounds like the beta to alpha transition ~

telnet_reddit_80 • -2 points • 30 March, 2013 02:53 PM

Please remember to read the posting rules: [Here](#)

You are not my supervisor!