

# Stop trying to be someone women need; Be someone they want

719 upvotes | 19 April, 2016 | by Archwinger

---

Today, let's take an honest look at what's happened in the world, and how that led to this whole Red Pill thing.

Before the female empowerment movement came along in its current form, women were dependent on men, pretty much by requirement. We talk a lot about the "good ol' days" where women were sexually conservative, married young, stayed faithful to decent guys who were good providers, had children, and lived generally happy, old-timey lives. Many clueless men today still follow these old rules, thinking that if they work hard to become educated, high-earning, good providers who are nice, decent guys, this will attract women by demonstrating what great husband material they are. Too bad for those guys – the rules have changed.

Here's an uncomfortable reality. Back in the "good ol' days", a lot of women weren't happy. Women didn't avoid promiscuity, marry at a young age to good-provider nice-guys, and stay in that situation for the rest of their lives because it was their greatest fantasy and their deepest want, due to their innate female natures. They did this because they didn't have any other choice. Women were financially dependent upon men, and if they wanted to avoid social ostracization, starvation, and failure, they'd pair off with a good provider and stick with him.

Women did not become good wives because they wanted to, or because it's where they gravitate toward due to feminine nature, or because it made them happy. They became good wives because society practically forced them to do so. Many women learned to be happy in that role, but absent social forces pushing women in that direction, it's not where most women would have ended up.

Women are not sexually conservative, faithful, good wives, or attracted to decent, good-provider men by nature. If the constraints that force women in this direction are removed, women are pretty much the opposite of all of that, by nature.

It's a woman's true nature to be slutty, unfaithful, a shitty marriage prospect, and attracted to cads. Unless the consequences for that behavior outweigh the fun. Remove the consequences, and we see their true nature.

If a woman chooses to be a non-slut, faithful, cultivate good marriage traits, or date decent guys, this isn't a biological drive. We like to call those good behaviors "feminine" traits, but they're actually the opposite of female nature. They're a conscious choice to go against a woman's nature for personal gain. A woman like that has done some logic, weighed the pros and cons, and decided that she stands to gain more from certain social behaviors than the fun she could have if she gave in to her nature.

In modern days, women vote, drive cars, hold jobs, and own property. Legally, they have all of the rights and capabilities granted to men. Sure, they're a lot worse at some things, and a lot better at other things – they're not actually equal to men in a biological sense, but they're equal in a legal, societal sense.

In modern days, birth control is plentiful and pretty darn effective. And abortion is legal. So a truly unwanted child is a pretty rare thing. And in the event that a child is conceived and not aborted, the legal system will garnish the father's paycheck and give a chunk of money to the mother to help with the childcare expenses. That's not really a profit-center for mom unless the father happens to be wealthy, but it's still free money.

So today, women who want to become self-sufficient can do so. Women can get a job and rent an apartment or buy a house and buy food and live, completely independent of a man. They don't need a provider. If they fuck up or suck at life or end up a single mother who's restricted employment-wise as a

result, there's even government assistance. And child support from the father if there are kids.

This means that when a woman is considering who she wants to date or marry, she doesn't need to consider his provider traits. At least not as strongly as women did historically. It's great if a guy is super-rich, but a normal dude with a normal middle-class salary isn't that impressive. She already has that kind of job herself. So do her friends. That guy's providership won't improve her quality of life significantly.

Once we remove financial dependency from women, take a look at the kinds of guys women fuck: Hot guys and fun guys. Muscles and cocky behavior and social aptitude. That's what women fuck. Not nice guys, not respectful guys, not deep intellectual conversation guys. All of those traits of husbands women married in the "good ol' days" weren't actually traits women liked. They were just using those men for money and social status. If the women didn't need that money and social standing and could have done whatever they wanted, they'd have fucked good-looking, confident, socially apt guys.

The only reason the "good ol' days" of good wives and sexually conservative behavior existed is because women were forced to behave themselves. They didn't want to. Real "feminine nature" isn't good behavior, it's very bad behavior. I guess "bad" is something of a subjective moral term. A better description might be that feminine nature is very self-interested, pleasure-seeking, live-for-today behavior.

It's 2016. Women have jobs now. They get health insurance and birth control through those jobs. Abortion is legal and entirely up to them in every way. They don't need men any more, so it's time to cast off any notion of the old rules: Stop trying to be someone she needs. She doesn't care about your fucking engineering degree, your salary, and how much housework you're willing to do to make her life more effortless, because you're just so damn nice.

Stop being nice. Stop being a generous, good provider. Stop being well-behaved, respectful, reserved, and frankly, boring as fuck. Women aren't impressed by money unless it's obscene amounts of fuck-you, hog-wild money. And women definitely aren't impressed by you doting on them and showing off how fucking kind and respectful you are.

Definitely keep working your ass off and making bank, but save that money. Spend it on shit you like. Maybe retire early. Don't let the girls know you're doing well financially. I won't tell.

Start being someone she wants. Start being muscular, cocky, fun, and socially apt. Spend your spare time on you, at the gym, at the shooting range, at the basketball court, at a martial arts class, or whatever the fuck you like. Brew beer, grill steaks, rebuild car engines, or hell, do girly hobbies if you have them. But don't waste a single second sacrificing something you like to do for a woman. That doesn't impress her. It's a turn-off.

It's time to start honoring women's real nature. Real women are slutty, shallow, fun-loving lunatics with shitty judgment. And they don't want men to save them from that any more. They fought long and hard to remove men from that role and in most cases, replace men with the government. So pay your taxes and let the government do its job. And start giving women what they want, not what they need.

Grow some muscles, drop the nice act, and start fucking them like the sluts they've fought so hard to become. And quit reminiscing about the good old days. Women weren't any better then. We just chained them up and pretended they were.

If you haven't checked out The Red Pill's off-Reddit site, it's worth a visit. Find this and other content [there](#).

---

## Comments

---

RED\_PILL\_TRUTH • 44 points • 19 April, 2016 07:36 PM

I don't know if this was phrased right or in a different matter than the stuff that is normally posted here, but this fucking clicked hard today (and I've considered myself unplugged since about 3 months into reading IM 2 years ago). There is never a going back. This is the age of information. If you're holding out for a pendulum kick back to more conservative times, or have a false reality of a third world Mecca filled with women yearning to be loyal faithful and fulfilling, you're still plugged in. This is the way it fucking is now. Kill whatever hope you have left of even the relationships the boomers had.

Archwinger[S] • 51 points • 19 April, 2016 08:08 PM

It's more than that. It's not just that there isn't some kind of conservative ideal to go back to.

Is that there never was a conservative ideal. Women weren't good wives, sexually conservative, or attractive marital partners because they wanted to be. They filled that role because they didn't have a choice. They were financially dependent on men and faced social ostracization if they got out of line.

Women weren't better back then. They were the same manipulative sluts, but had to hide it and step in line because society forced them to behave.

Society enslaved women and forced them to be something they weren't, for the good of society. Men were slaves too -- just filling a different role.

Female empowerment movements decided that the male role was somehow better than the female role, so they fought to be men instead of women. But when they got halfway there, they'd abolished all of the consequences for deviating from female social norms without instituting any of the male responsibilities, and they stopped and said, "Hey! This is great!"

RED\_PILL\_TRUTH • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 09:32 PM

Yeah, I don't think that came across as I met it. It's oddly soothing to realize that I haven't missed some golden era of religion and culture. Even though we are the first generation to see full cause of hypergamy unleashed with zero effect and full support of the culture and the government, this is still the best time to be alive in the history of the world. I think there's a lot of people out there holding out hope of said Mecca, but if you understand that the way things are now isn't a different reality, but just a more clear and realistic version of reality, the idea of the Mecca becomes laughable. Love it.

103342 • 12 points • 19 April, 2016 10:21 PM

There is a sad part about living in our times though. For both men and women.

Marriages worked because it was socially enforced by society, but also because it satisfied a part of the biological imperative of men (to be providers) and for women (to nurture a child).

Ironically, I think the biggest losers of all the societal changes were women themselves. Men are still happy, even alone some drown themselves in porn and video games.

Women in the west are unhappy according to researches you can find online. They are more depressed than the women who live in extreme patriarchal countries.

cheeky\_throwaway101 • 9 points • 19 April, 2016 10:48 PM

Yep, apparently since "female happiness" studies began in 1970, women have never been so

miserable. And this was a time when the Vietnam war was in full swing as well as the Nixon recession.

Women are so easily manipulated, and by shoving this "Carrie Bradshaw, devil wearing Prada whilst having lunch with Ugly Betty and Allie Mcbeal" lifestyle down women's throats, it's easy to see why the modern woman is the way she is.

Unfortunately when she finally wakes up around 35 and realises that she's actually fucking miserable as hell, she blames it on all the "pig men" around her. As, god forbid she actually takes some accountability and blames herself for her own mistakes. Then she'll get pregnant with some poor schlub who she will eventually divorce rape, and bring the children up with the state, teaching her daughters to do the same so she can live vicariously through them. And then the whole cycle repeats again. Ad infinitum.

Until all manual and the majority of administrative based work is outsourced to robots, where men will begin to die off through loneliness as the top tier men share the rest of the women between them.

The key is to somehow be one of the top tier men.

Wel108 • 9 points • 20 April, 2016 03:15 AM

You sir, have it pretty much figured out. I would say though that if you do want a relationship, the only way to do it is to get a woman significantly lower than your SMV, make sure she's from a traditional home, and be masculine as fuck.

[deleted] • 5 points • 20 April, 2016 12:51 PM

Don't forget not caring if she cheats. No matter what, she will cheat. Sometimes even with a beta.

Archterus • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 11:02 PM

Agree, and apart from men the real losers are the kids. So often I hear women bemoaning the labour involved in raising a child. So often I hear the call for monetary compensation. Ideally one would of thought raising a child was a privilege, not a burden.

But there we go again, ideally. Doesn't exist. A good barometer for checking how far along the unplugging spectrum you are is how one gets triggered. Feeling angry, OK, still some unplugging to go.

The final phase, amused mastery, implies a certain Buddhistic calmness. Not nihilism, rather just being awake to the real nature of things.

RedPillAnonymous • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 05:27 PM

It's like government corruption. It isn't worse today, we are just more aware of it.

CornyHoosier • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 09:43 PM

Society enslaved women and forced them to be something they weren't, for the good of society. Men were slaves too -- just filling a different role.

Would you consider BP men "slaves" to the legacy system? We no longer *need* to provide for women as women are now on their own.

I've personally adopted an 'Adapt or Die' mentality so I'm really outside the system either way. Especially

since I'm not having children.

Archwinger[S] • 6 points • 19 April, 2016 10:23 PM

Considering that a BP man isn't really getting anything out of the system in most cases, it's hard to consider him a "slave". Technically, he could walk away and do something else any time he wanted. The system's not holding anything over him. He has nothing to lose. He's the one keeping himself in place.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 12:53 PM

I argue there never was.

You think those guys were happy? They were pushed into it too. Worked great for society when farming was the main industry, people had to be collectivist like that.

If anything, it's freeing. you no longer have a series of dependants to choose from. They don't need you for shit, and you can just persue your dream, unhindered.

You don't have to go fight in the trenches, sacrafice your back to keep them fed, or otherwise become the ploughhorse. Any man complaining about that in TRP probably hasn't been exposed to the kind of work thats involved with a 1.0 man.

All that man had was the good woman at home.. todays man has so much more

TheDonald2k16 • 110 points • 19 April, 2016 06:45 PM

Good post. Women definately are not conservative by nature.

As a Christian, for a long time I thought Christian women were different, that they still followed the rules of the older days and that if I picked a good Christian woman to marry things would be OK because her Christian beliefs will shield her from the hypergamic ways of society. But I quickly learned this isn't the case. There isn't much that can reverse a woman's natural biological programming, as well as programming & brainwashing they receive from society, to be hyerpgamic sluts. Christian women will just learn to hide it better. This is why I will never get married.

I go to Church every Sunday and its sad how many couples I see there that are clearly dead bedroom Beta Bux marriages. It's blatantly obvious that the post-wall, post-CC women came in, roped in a beta, popped out kids, and he has now served his use. The woman resents the man, has no attraction to him, distances herself from him, and shows no affection toward him.

[deleted] • 51 points • 19 April, 2016 07:11 PM

There are no functional differences between Christian women and nonChristian women. Christian women want to fuck hot, good looking, interesting men, just like nonChristian women do.

It's just that Christian women are better at concealing those preferences than nonChristian women are. It's just that Christian women have hoodwinked everyone in their congregations about how prim, proper and chaste they are. Christian women hide behind morality and propriety and "I'm tired of the games and the players" and the "I want to do it the RIGHT way *this* time" claims.

TheDonald2k16 • 13 points • 19 April, 2016 07:20 PM

Right on the money. Christian Women just hide it better.

They will still fall victim to getting tingles from Chads and having sex. Then they just pray for forgiveness, saying God has forgiven my sins, and hope to do better next time. The whole forgiveness of sins concept in fact actually makes them more likely to fuck a Chad.

There is a solid HB9 at my church, single, 21 years old. Very involved in the church and the college group leadership. I always wonder how many dudes she has fucked, as she has to get mountains of validation daily, lots of propositions from Chads, as well as have a shitload of orbiters. I'd be shocked if her N-Count was 0. Watching her at Church you'd think she is the biggest Christian ever, but I wonder if its just an act, or if she is trying to overcompensate for her guilt of fucking Chads.

[deleted] • 23 points • 19 April, 2016 07:28 PM

Studies show something like 80 to 90% of never married Christian women age 16 and over are not virgins.

Christian women are basically like nonChristian women in every way, except that most of them are (nominally) against abortion (and that's mainly to establish their Christian cred).

Christian women think their "faith" and their anti-abortion stances make them "better" than nonChristian women. Nah. Most of them are still sluts. And in my experience, the Christian women who aren't sluts desperately want to be sluts.

TheDonald2k16 • 12 points • 19 April, 2016 07:34 PM

It's really surprising.

I was a church person all my life. Went to church every Sunday from the day I was born. Grew up with the same people in Sunday School classes, youth groups, and all of that. Thought we would all be good Christians who did no wrong.

Going to a Church Camp when we were 15 years old put all of that to rest pretty quick. People sneaking in alcohol, sneaking out of the cabins to fuck the girls on the other side of the camp, as 15 year olds.

Then I worked at a Church Camp as a counselor when I was 17. There was always drama because of the rumors about counselors fucking each other. It was no different from an episode of Vanderpump Rules. If you got caught doing something wrong like fucking you got fired. Didn't stop counselors from getting their fuck on. Lots of firings happened that summer.

If you saw these women every Sunday like I did you'd think they were perfect little well behaved angels, because that is the facade they put on all the time for being Christian girls from a every-Sunday churchgoing Christian family. To this day they still put on this facade and we are all 28 years old now. Some poor beta Christian is going to marry them(if they haven't married already) thinking they are a pure, white as snow woman.

[deleted] • 6 points • 19 April, 2016 07:38 PM

I might do a post on this. Haven't seen one on Christian women in a good long while.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 07:57 PM

check out Rollo's post on it. You don't want to regurgitate the same shit, but he was way out in left field with that one.

TheDonald2k16 • 4 points • 19 April, 2016 07:41 PM

AWALT. Always. No matter what.

When I tell my mom and dad and married Christian sisters that I won't get married, and tell them its because all women are hypergamous sluts, they always reply with "But if you marry a good Christian woman!!!".

Nope. AWALT.

onlyjedileft • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:45 AM

I'd love to read it. I mean AWALT but it would definitely be an interesting read

smartengineer93 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:06 PM

i know a girl who randomly shaved her head bc she felt more attached to it than God. Beautiful long blonde hair to the waist to bald in an evening on a whim. Never decided if it was the right choice or an attention play...

[deleted] • 10 points • 19 April, 2016 07:55 PM

Christian men are getting cucked by Jesus. Jesus stands in a surrogate to the husband. When the husband helps her when she is sick, or in financial distressed the wife gives all the credit to god. Christian women are enabled by a God that will always forgive them so they can be as bad as they want to their husbands and reject all masculine accountability. its a terrible problem

Wel108 • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 03:00 AM

That's not necessarily true. They don't thank god for helping them get through it. They thank god for giving them a "loving husband."

masnera • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 02:05 AM

first you validate her -Solid HB9, then you demean/undermine her by "wondering" how much is her N-Count, and by suspecting her of overcompensating for guilt.(Guilt for what? for being a woman?) Wow ...your comment is solid Beta orbiter/stalker hamstering.(i can picture you while staring at her from a distance) Why not try to approach her and try if you can score instead or at least establish a communication. And what is your purpose going at the church? her? or just to observe people, think of how many good things for yourself you can do with that time.

TheDonald2k16 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:33 PM

Perhaps you should think things through before spouting off ignorance.

It's hard not to notice this girl - she is in the church leadership, does a lot of things on Sundays(i.e. greeting people at the door). She is an HB9 in a sea of UB4s and less. 95% of the women at the church are an UB4 or worse, so this HB9 stands out like a sore thumb. I don't need to observe her from a distance. And I don't approach because I am not interested in her. Just because she is an HB9 doesn't mean I am interested.

I go to Church because I am a Christian and its what Christians do on Sunday. I don't need to explain myself or justify myself to a clear atheist fedora faggot like yourself. I hate atheists far more than I hate blue pillers and feminists(though they usually tend to be both at the same time).

masnera • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:40 PM

clear atheist fedora faggot like yourself.

ha..ha.. wow, very creative. keep it up. Best regards to the HB9 in a sea of UB4..oh...and i hope you managed your hard on while staring at her, that would be awkward. (If it's noticeable though...) peace

Wel108 • 8 points • 20 April, 2016 03:07 AM\*

I'm going to go ahead and disagree with an endorsed here. Christian women do know how to conceal it better because they logically and rationally know it's wrong and it's frowned upon amongst their family and religious friends. They do still fight their temptations just like everyone else does, and just like their non christian female counter parts do.

But, there's christian women that literally have the fear of god in them, and would fight their hypergamy till the end. Then there's Christian women that will fight it a little, they might make their "mistakes" here and there but ultimately realize the greater more rational truth. They can't live that life and be happy.

Because their whole lives, what's been considered happiness is a traditional home. These women aren't different, they aren't not hypergamous, they just simply realize and think a little more logically.

I believe it's easier to keep a christian woman from straying than it is a non christian woman. It's not that it won't happen, it's just that they're more grounded in what's more important. So as long as you're a masculine enough man, you have a greater chance at keeping an honest relationship. Which is what OP was actually touching on.

Edit: When i refer to Christian women, I'm referring to true believers. Not posers. Women that have been raised by a strong religious father in a traditional home. The posers are probably worse than non posers.

pridebrah • 11 points • 20 April, 2016 05:13 AM\*

Nailed it. The level of faith depends on the life experience and maturity of the person, and then that level of faith carries over to what level of conviction they operate under. If a girl grows up with a strong male figure or goes through some life changing trauma that lead her to faith, there's a higher chance they'll simply operate differently than most of these girls wearing the Christian label. The key is to not confuse this with thinking they're robots who don't have a sexual side and aren't tempted by good looking men still. They will simply have higher conviction to not act on it or are more likely to not do so.

That higher moral level doesn't make them immune to fucking up, but it improves the chances of having a better woman around than Cindy Club goer who openly doesn't give a shit from the word go.

The unicorn doesn't exist, but some of these chicks are better than others; some of them even have a bit of logic to their thought process (gasp). However, even the most logical of men and women can succumb and contradict their values, which is why the core values of TRP still apply: focus on you and enjoy the moment.

ps. There was a good thread awhile back about all the TRP-style scriptures in the Bible. It is hardly a book of cuck or cuck examples.

Wel108 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 12:43 PM\*

You explained that much better than me I feel. But to re-iterate, yes, I agree 100%. Do you have a link to that thread?

RedAntidote • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:42 PM

So well said brother. Took the words out of my mouth. It's the reason why I cannot enter an LTR with a woman who is not a Christian like myself.

[deleted] • 1 points • 20 April, 2016 08:54 AM

[permanently deleted]

RedAntidote • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:45 PM

Those sound like women that just wore their religious affiliation like a badge and did not actually live through their faith. Having gone to a Catholic university, I would say MOST Christian women are like this. You can tell the difference between a woman that just says they are Christian versus one who was raised properly in a traditional household with strong Christian values and has the fear of God in them.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:42 PM

I despise Christian today, specially church going ones. Because not ONE of them is living the life as Christianity is teaching. They are going to church to feel better with themselves and to look better to others. That's all one big fucking lie, pure dishonesty.

And it's tremendous what kind of totally anti-God-word these people are able to do, because, you know, it's gonna be forgiven.

I remember going to Church people social event with my Mother, which is orthodox Christian, and that night I fucked one of these holy virgins and two more in coming days. Bitches.

Archwinger[S] • 63 points • 19 April, 2016 06:50 PM

Looking at this another way, one might argue that our society is a collection of social norms and consequences that make humans more than animals. If there were no controls in place, most humans of any sex would steal, harm others, murder, rape.

It's comforting to think that humans have some kind of inborn, innate morality that makes us all good people, but that's not the case. The main thing that stops most people from acting poorly is consequences.

Female empowerment movements have fought long and hard to remove consequences from poor female behavior, and unsurprisingly, we find that in the absence of restrictions, they behave poorly.

[deleted] • 20 points • 20 April, 2016 02:21 AM

we find that in the absence of restrictions, they behave poorly.

I can't say that our modern society is "absent of restrictions." But then, "restrictions" isn't the right word. Social expectations might be a better one.

Women are status machines, sniffing out whatever they think will be the most popular and commonly accepted thing and acting like that's what they wanted all along. Back when the social expectation was incentivized to be a "good girl," that's what they wanted. It was rewarded and reinforced.

Nowadays, taking duck-faced selfies of yourself getting trashed in a bar while you make out with guys in the bathroom and put pictures of it on instagram is a social expectation that's rewarded. It's incentivized. Women are responding to those incentives.

It's not that modern women are a raw, natural version of themselves, now that society is no longer influencing them to be a certain way. Society is very much influencing them to be a certain way. Girls now think it's shameful to be a virgin, and a lot of them think a high notch count makes them cool. They didn't invent these ideas on their own.

In a lot of ways I think that we are exacerbating the hypergamy with our culture worse than it would normally be. I've known a lot of women who were really slutty and I can tell you they don't really enjoy it. It eats away at them after a while. Studies have confirmed that one-night stands tend to make women feel worse about themselves and their self image.

But again, we are incentivizing this behavior, incentivizing waiting until you are post-wall to want commitment, and incentivizing divorce through cash prizes. Women are behaving poorly not only because of innate hypergamy, but also because our society is incentivizing them to.

TheDonald2k16 • 16 points • 19 April, 2016 07:00 PM

Female empowerment movements have fought long and hard to remove consequences from poor female behavior, and unsurprisingly, we find that in the absence of restrictions, they behave poorly.

Hence, it's never a woman's fault.

Like that female employee at Nintendo who got fired for being a hooker and pedophile, and how the ultra beta gaming community didn't place any of the blame on her, no, they blamed evil misogynistic Nintendo for firing a strong independent woman who did no wrong.

The woman who cheats on her husband, it's never her fault. The husband slaves away to provide for the family, and she goes out and cheats anyway, because "the thrill was gone". And it's never her fault. It's the husband's fault for some reason.

My aunt cheated on my uncle. Of course, my aunt's sisters and friends all blamed my uncle for some reason even though he did no wrong.

The\_DogeWhisperer • 5 points • 19 April, 2016 09:15 PM

Because all the males in our society are offspring of the males that went out of their way to protect women. It's in our nature.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:34 AM\*

[deleted]

What is this?

FieldLine • 21 points • 19 April, 2016 06:59 PM

It's comforting to think that humans have some kind of inborn, innate morality that makes us all good people, but that's not the case. The main thing that stops most people from acting poorly is consequences.

Look at the Bible in the beginning of Genesis right before Noah and the flood - there are 8 verses there that describe a lawless, morally degenerate society that was totally broken down. And the truly amazing thing is that the Bible's description of the times then isn't so far off from what we have today. Putting aside whether you believe in the Bible, it's a fascinating insight into human nature.

103342 • 13 points • 19 April, 2016 07:14 PM

The bible, just like many ancient texts and religions, is a set of rules and behaviours that are the basis of a patriarchal society, arguably the only type of society that actually works.

Pattern recognition is one thing our brain can do REALLY well. If something is imposed by some civilization you can pretty well know that it has some strong basis in human behaviour.

You can analyse many cultures we think are absurd: Africans cutting clitoris, indians burying anomalous children, and others. And realize they do it for a very understandable reason. Be hypergamy control, demografinc control, or w/e.

The\_DogeWhisperer • 21 points • 19 April, 2016 09:11 PM

I'm not religious, but I've gotten to the point where if it was my choice I would have everyone become religious just so western society would stop derailing itself.

ShounenEgo • 5 points • 20 April, 2016 07:08 AM

And then you pretty much realize why the smarter people, back then, had to create religion in order to keep the less-smarter people (aka the hivemind, crowd, whatever you wanna call it) in check.

I dropped religion, but not before I carefully examine multiple iterations and understand the fundamental concepts that communicated in a deeper way. Stuff that you just can't decide to drop overnight.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 10:23 PM

[permanently deleted]

savoryprunes • 10 points • 20 April, 2016 06:10 AM

Yep. They reject the established religion to form a new religion more to their liking. Then they act like they are somehow more "evolved." All they've done is replace the concept of "God" with their own navel-gazing.

tompanz • 5 points • 20 April, 2016 06:43 AM

I have a feeling that what we are experiencing with modern society has happened *many* times before, each with the same outcome. We just never seem to learn.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 10:54 AM

History always repeats itself

tompanz • 8 points • 20 April, 2016 12:05 PM

This is one of the less obvious reasons I hate progressiveism. It pushes the concept that we are in a uniquely enlightened age, and that all men before us were stupid and /or evil, and that all women were brainwashed dumb slaves. Once you realize that men 70, 100, and even 1000 years ago were just as, if not more, intelligent than we are now, you begin to realize that they had reasons for everything they did. Sure some of those things were due to limited information, but I'd wager that they were far more often right.

This mentality causes us to keep repeating the same damn mistakes over and over again. Both as individuals and as a society. How many more times does this shit have to happen before we finally learn our lesson?

Those who do not learn from the past, are doomed to repeat it.

Nicolay77 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 05:52 PM

As Herodotus tells the story, the Scythians were engaged in a 28-year war with their neighbors, the Persians. When the Scythians finally returned home, they found intruders in their tents.

They were the bastard children of the Scythians' lonely wives and their slaves. Gass believes the slaughter that ensued was important enough that it was described in detail on the vessel.

Herodotus writes that the grown bastard children went forth to engage the returning warriors, and many lives on both sides were lost.

From here.

The poor lonely wives. What happened to Ulysses was legend because his wife rejected the suitors for a while. It was so uncommon it had to be remembered.

tompanz • 1 point • 21 April, 2016 04:41 AM

Women are the primary victims of war doncha know! How would those poor women deal with not getting a constant stream of dick?

RedAntidote • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:33 PM

I agree, it is something that is amazing to see every day. Man is sinful by nature due to the fall of man. It's quite literally a part of our being. For me, it makes the pill much easier to swallow. No being on this earth can be perfect or break from that mold. That girl you may think is "the one" included. Some may have better control over their sinful nature than others, but no one is devoid of that nature.

adam-l • 5 points • 20 April, 2016 07:20 AM\*

If there were no controls in place, most humans of any sex would steal, harm others, murder, rape.

Pretty much sums up why the "elite", those that have no repercussions for whatever they do, are such scum.

It's comforting to think that humans have some kind of inborn, innate morality that makes us all good people, but that's not the case. The main thing that stops most people from acting poorly is consequences.

The one does not exclude the other. Indeed, in the absence of consequences people will develop into shitty characters. That does not exclude the case for an innate morality.

Humans were always social beings, and society means interaction, reward and punishment. It only makes sense, in evolutionary terms, that some basic morality was hardwired into them, to make them more capable of navigating the basic social situations efficiently. Babies are known to have morality. High-level economic predators, that can take decisions which can bring down whole economies in other countries, live in an environment that quite meticulously distances them from experiencing personally the consequences of their decisions, in order to ease their moral turmoil - or they are proper psychopaths to begin with.

So, as in most all human behavior, like sexuality, there is a built-in component for morality, as well as a large space for societal influence in order to mold the final, operating, version of each individual's morality.

in the absence of restrictions, [women] behave poorly.

They sure do, but we would disagree on what constitutes poor behavior. I have no problem with a woman sleeping with whomever she wants, whenever she wants. I have a great problem with the females' price fixing on sex, by slut-shaming. And a great problem with women benefiting from society, not giving back what is their expected part. I would go as far as to define class societies as societies in which women benefit from the contributions of men that they (women) have no prospect of paying back sexually. "To increase desires to an unbearable level while making the fulfillment of them more and

more inaccessible: this was the single principle upon which Western society was based”, as writer Michel Houellebecq captured it. Women's greatest immorality is their semi-conscious subscription to that plan.

Archterus • 5 points • 19 April, 2016 09:58 PM

Agree. Morality is just an abstraction, the universe is neutral and does not give a fuck. Sadly.

The notion of there being a germ of good that exist within all people is not that far removed from the other great myth, all mothers love their children unconditionally.

It IS all about consequence and what is tolerable within the limits of the given cultural norms at the time. Accepting this is another step along the road to freedom and the cultivation of amused mastery. That said, don't become Raskolnikov and fall for a whore.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 09:35 AM

Looking at this another way, one might argue that our society is a collection of social norms and consequences that make humans more than animals. If there were no controls in place, most humans of any sex would steal, harm others, murder, rape.

Which is why when I see someone posting about men being more moral and honorable than women, I see a rationalization.

Men are just held to higher standard than women right now by society.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:05 PM

I disagree. We are innately more moral and have more moral values. Women are amoral, men are immoral or moral.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:47 PM

You have the freedom to be wrong if you wish, it's your life you are putting on the line by believing that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:50 PM

Nah. There are horrible evil selfish men, including me among them. But there are good men too. There are very few good women, If any. Women are amoral, men choose their morals.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:53 PM

You are in for a world of disappointment if you try to rely on that.

Everyone has their price. The only difference is how easy it is to meet it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:55 PM

I agree. Everyone has their price. You can trust very few people, if anyone. I'm just saying I rather trust a man over a woman.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:57 PM

Of course. Society will come down on him harder for betrayal. So he has a higher price set for it due to that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 02:02 PM

Not even that. I just think men are innately more trustworthy than women. Men can be manipulative, but it isn't embedded into our DNA like it is women. Men

can lie, but all women lie. Get what I'm saying? Men are much more noble a gender than women

benuntu • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:57 PM

I disagree that we are not innately moral. As a social creature, our entire society has been built upon following morals, which is why we've codified them into law from the beginning of recorded history. We are a physically weak species and rely on our brain and our "tribe" for survival. Now the degree to which we follow a moral code wildly varies, but in all human civilizations there are common threads. Namely, don't murder or steal.

This is also not unique to humans. It turns out that multiple species in the animal kingdom show "ethical" behavior. It benefits a community by making it stronger, when the members of it can live more peacefully. But this basic moral code of not killing each other is quite different than offensive behavior of women (or men). There is nothing wrong biologically speaking for a woman or man to spread their reproductive genes, and is actually beneficial in many ways. We humans have created a complex set of rules that far exceeds basic morality. And the problem is that opinions on those rules vary wildly depending on the individual. This is why some people think it's fine to have multiple sexual partners, while others believe it's immoral.

SubbaHubba • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 10:13 PM

When it comes to women, there are basically two types: there are whores, and then there are Christian whores.

youssarian • 6 points • 19 April, 2016 11:43 PM

I'm a Christian in college who regularly meets with other believers during the week. I'm slowly starting to realize that most of the girls are not different than nonbelieving girls in this regard. It surprises me because they really do give off that air of being different. Maybe one or two of them are. But most of them? Unlikely.

[deleted] • 17 points • 20 April, 2016 12:41 AM

None of them are different. ALL WOMEN ARE SLUTS. YOUR TEACHER, YOUR COUSIN, YOUR MOM, MY MOM, MY GRANDMA, THE LUNCHLADY. ALL OF EM.

[deleted] • 12 points • 20 April, 2016 02:33 AM

Keep it up, you will be endorsed before your HS diploma

[deleted] • 7 points • 20 April, 2016 02:40 AM

Can't tell if you're mocking me or being sarcasti, or if you mean it. I'll be a much better redpiller and masculine man by then though, more self actualized. I'm stuck in the house right now though cause my moms got me on lockdown till summer starts, so I've been on trp a lot. I usually read history or trp after I work out and do my homework.

[deleted] • 7 points • 20 April, 2016 02:46 AM

That little point you have was given by me.

Still confused about whether I am mocking?

Anyway, you have work to do. A touch of hatred for the feminine is OK. But you will see that all that anger dissipates when you realize your role in *making* those unicorns. They dont exist

naturally, men create great women as we raise great children.

[deleted] • 4 points • 20 April, 2016 02:58 AM

Hopefully I do get endorsed eventually though. Probably down the road once I'm a more prominent member of the sub, and I'm more self actualized in my masculinity. + more experience for essays and FRs and such. Being with only ten girls kinda limits my plating experience.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 02:55 AM

Oh, okay. Thank you. I thought nightwing gave it to me this whole time haha. And I dont feel angry, I just hate women. I'm a huge misogynist and I embrace it. Women are parasitic creatures that exist for reproduction. If women didn't have pussies, ass or titties, I would have 0 reason to even interact with them. I really don't want to create unicorns though honestly. If were talking in the virgin sense. I just want a slut who does whatever I tell her, at all times.

I do agree though. Men form efficient women. Women left to their own devices are pretty garbage. Without men's supervision, the majority of them are lost.

XXXmormon • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 07:40 AM

Just be aware that you can't make a woman a slut who will do everything you ask. You have to be the type of man they wouldn't think of saying no to.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:07 PM

I know. Can't be a loser and get pussy. Girls already love me , but I don't think I'm alpha. Nor am I beta. Never been either. I'm kind of like an amalgamation of the two , plus sigma.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 02:31 AM

Bro, that *air of being different*, its all in your head.

Those bib!e study girls are DTF and complete sluts *for the right man*

Source: me. I have crushed it in the deep south just as easy as NYC and LA

juliusstreicher • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 09:19 AM\*

Tell me about it. I went to a Christian college in the late 70s. Now, this wasn't a liberal, "believe what you want and you'll get heaven and everything else" college, it was HARDCORE. Matrons still wore hair in buns, no pants for women, worship meetings twice a day, no extended contact across gender lines under pains of expulsion. The word "damn" was only a verb, never an exclamation. We were out in the woods, with less than 50 students, and no single person was allowed to live outside of the dorm, to keep temptation at bay.

I was in love with one of the female students, and she seemed to glow in class and particularly in chapel. I later found out who put the glow on her cheeks-rich and jacked Chad, that's who. They were sneaking out at nighttime, etc... Also, when anybody teased her about her nighttime excursions, she always got that cat who ate the canary look.

Of course, 20 some years later, her best friend was trying to set me up with her, and, the truth came out. Rich and jacked didn't marry her, but, "...he, basically raped her while they were in school." Of course,

nobody at the school heard of the assault, and nobody could ever tell a difference in her behaviour...I guess she was too intimidated to act as if she had been violated, and too oppressed to know that an actual rape took place!

Point being, I would be more surprised than not if one were a virgin, or if several of them had not pulled a train or two.

markyLEpirate • 6 points • 20 April, 2016 12:00 AM

In my experience, religious girls are the sluttiest

theforshizzalist • 6 points • 20 April, 2016 02:53 AM

My brother is a Christian, very devout. A little over a year ago he met this girl at church. She was the shining example of the good Christian girl. Virgin, very modest, very sweet, everyone loved her, good heart, yada yada yada. They began dating and my brother quickly fell in love with her. After dating for almost six months, questions about the future started coming from her. At the time he was working at Chick-fil-a and playing music. He wanted to go into ministry because he thought it was his calling. In the end she ended up breaking up with him because he didn't have any aspirations to make money and live luxuriously. She said there wasn't any money in ministry.

After seeing the way she broke his heart and the shit she said like that, I lost all hope in the fairy tale ending. When I found TRP and started internalizing it, during my denial phase, I started thinking that the good girls go to church. Then I thought about her and how she did my brother and I saw the fairy tale for what it was. TRP is truth, no matter who she is or where she's from.

J\_AsapGem • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 07:37 PM\*

same here my brother, AWALT applies to christian women aswell, i thought i had found a nice pentecostal girl, but as you said... they know to hide it better, it's truly sad how this age we're living in is, but we have to choice but to accept it the way it is instead of how we want it to be. The divorce rate has also gone up in the church, within a couple years i've seen so many couples divorce, society has done an excellent Job shaping these women, because of how things are now, as you said they don't appreciate the man anymore or have affection for him, my best friend mom left her family of 2 kids, she was married to her husband for 20 years christian family, for a rich banker AWALT.

Physio\_Tool • 44 points • 19 April, 2016 06:30 PM

The women and men of today really are just products of the environment. AWALT and AMALT: Any girl or guy living on an amish plantation will be virgins until marriage. Put those same people in the student dorms at Arizona University and watch them fuck around like rabbits. But dont get mad that the girls who live at AU arent acting like Sarah Plain and Tall. We live in the era we live in, exploit and enjoy it.

Archwinger[S] • 48 points • 19 April, 2016 06:43 PM

There's another layer to this, though.

Are girls on an Amish plantation conservative because they want to be, or because society forces them to be?

Are girls in the coed dorms at U of Slut-town sluts because they want to be, or are they just trying to fit in?

Female nature, in its purest form, is what women would do if your removed judgment and consequences and just let them do whatever they wanted. And while that 100% theoretically ideal world with no consequences or judgment whatsoever isn't possible, the closer we get to that, the more women become crazy sluts with shit judgement who fuck hot guys for fun.

Demonspawn • 32 points • 19 April, 2016 08:46 PM

Are girls on an Amish plantation conservative because they want to be, or because society forces them to be?

Are girls in the coed dorms at U of Slut-town sluts because they want to be, or are they just trying to fit in?

Women are water. They will take whatever shape their environment provides.

We are the products of millions of years of evolution in which men didn't reproduce unless they accomplished (shaped the environment) and women reproduced unless they were too much of a burden (if they sloshed out of their container).

[deleted] • 9 points • 19 April, 2016 08:01 PM

Read up on r-K selection theory, some conservatives have adapted it to politics and its explanatory power is impressive. But basically women act with a lot of r characteristics; sexual promiscuity and low value of their children (abortion) being topical.

Demonspawn • 15 points • 19 April, 2016 08:49 PM

Because women don't know reproductive pressure, their default state is capable of bearing children. Men do; men have to achieve in order to reproduce.

It's why western nations moved from K to r as we allowed women's suffrage.

AFPJ • 12 points • 19 April, 2016 10:55 PM\*

western nations moved from K to r

Not much "Western" about us anymore, we're the next Zimbabwe along with all other countries retarded enough to even humor the notion of divide / conquer tactics like Feminism, Identity Politics and so on. Literally the only sane places 20-40 years from now will likely be Poland, Russia, Japan, if they stay the course, and perhaps even China.

If China or Russia gets a grip on their infrastructure & learns to incentivize rural areas instead of mega-cities which, much like the mouse Universe experiment always result in rock bottom birth rates, they'll become the next top dog.

Pretty much the only places not locked into a solid trajectory right now are Hong Kong and Singapore and MAYBE Berlin in the extremely unlikely case they find their balls again and gas or just kick out all the recent "immigrants".

[deleted] • 4 points • 20 April, 2016 02:26 AM

we're the next Zimbabwe along with all other countries retarded enough to even humor the notion of divide / conquer tactics like Feminism, Identity Politics and so on

So you think Zimbabwe is corrupt because of feminism and identity politics? Pardon my bluntness but that makes no fucking sense and does not correspond with reality even in a tangential way.

Literally the only sane places 20-40 years from now will likely be Poland, Russia, Japan, if they stay the course, and perhaps even China.

This comment reveals that you have a really narrow, meme-ish understanding of the world.

A lot of corrupt failed states and failed societies have extremely strict, conservative expectations of women. There is no need to falsely reduce the entirety of human society to one variable when doing so is shown wrong by even a moment's cursory glance at the state of failed societies in the world today.

As endorsed contributors we have a greater responsibility to not make up random shit and try to pass it off as fact.

AFPJ • 4 points • 20 April, 2016 03:20 AM

So you think Zimbabwe is corrupt because of feminism and identity politics

That's your statement, not sure where you got it either. You clearly failed to understand my meaning that the U.S. will match Zimbabwe in terms of rape, violent crime and corruption as our demographics come to resemble theirs.

A lot of corrupt failed states and failed societies have extremely strict, conservative expectations of women. There is no need to falsely reduce the entirety of human society to one variable when doing so is shown wrong by even a moment's cursory glance at the state of failed societies in the world today.

"you're wrong, its not that simple, although let me not provide any solid evidence to the contrary" Ok.

As endorsed contributors we have a greater responsibility to not make up random shit and try to pass it off as fact.

This isn't even worth a response. Why did you post?

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:05 AM

These were your words, not mine:

we're the next Zimbabwe along with all other countries retarded enough to even humor the notion of divide / conquer tactics like Feminism, Identity Politics and so on

why are you pretending it was me that made this claim? It made no sense. There is no relationship between "being Zimbabwe" and "feminism, identity politics, and so on" as you claim.

You clearly failed to understand my meaning that the U.S. will match Zimbabwe in terms of rape, violent crime and corruption as our demographics come to resemble theirs.

Zimbabwe is a horror story that you know of by name because of their self-imposed hyperinflation and economic chaos. By "demographics" i understand you're saying that they have problems because they are black. However rates of development and security vary tremendously through different African countries which all have those "demographics."

Furthermore, in the US those "demographic" trends you fear have been continuing consistently for years yet violent crime has been going down.

This isn't even worth a response. Why did you post?

I posted it because I think it's bad for the community when people shit talk like they're political scientists when they don't know what the fuck they're talking about, and their opinions aren't based on facts but on memes.

StoicCrane • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 01:36 AM

The US is done. With the recent fraud in the NYS primaries there's a chance Hilary will have a shot at being POTUS. If that nightmare becomes real the feminist floodgate will know no bounds.

[deleted] • -1 points • 20 April, 2016 02:31 AM

If that nightmare becomes real the feminist floodgate will know no bounds.

Everyone loves some good slippery slope fallacy wanking. I see TRP isn't above some good old fashioned melodramatic alarmism.

StoicCrane • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 02:33 AM

Feel free to disagree. Just stating what I see.

StoicCrane • 1 point • 30 April, 2016 12:44 AM

To shed a little light on the melodrama. Considering that she intends to overhaul the cabinet there's nothing threatening about Hilary to Male interests at all!

adr007 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 11:41 AM

I'd like to hear more about your opinions of Singapore and HK and what you think the current trajectory is.

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 10:28 PM

[permanently deleted]

Archwinger[S] • 13 points • 19 April, 2016 10:31 PM

Exactly. Men and women had defined roles. They were both slaves to the system, just different kinds of slaves.

When female empowerment movements came along, they decided that the male role was somehow superior to the female role, which is kind of funny, because long ago, the class of people that stayed home and didn't work while benefiting from the work of others were considered the privileged ones. Even among the rabble, there wasn't a peasant alive who wouldn't want to be a servant in the palace instead of a field worker.

But whatever. It was decided that women needed to become men, so female empowerment movements got halfway there. They destroyed all of the social consequences that existed for straying from female social norms. But they never quite got around to imposing all of the male responsibilities on women. I think they're pretty happy at this halfway point.

Trump\_for\_prez2016 • 6 points • 20 April, 2016 03:56 AM

Are girls in the coed dorms at U of Slut-town sluts because they want to be, or are they just trying to fit in?

I would note that the theoretical coed slut *does* have strong pressures to act like a slut from her peers.

Wilreadit • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 04:14 AM

The Amish chicks do not fuck because they are afraid of ostracism.

The Arizona chick fuck because they want to have fun.

TheReformist94 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 09:53 AM

Women don't fuck to fit in. they enjoy fucking around and taking in as much cock as possible otherwise they wouldn't do it

Joseph\_the\_Carpenter • 0 points • 19 April, 2016 11:04 PM

Are girls on an Amish plantation conservative because they want to be, or because society forces them to be?

But will Hiberina be satisfied with one man? Sooner compel her to be satisfied with one eye! You tell me of the high repute of some maiden, who lives on her paternal farm...I will believe in your paternal farm, but will anyone tell me that nothing ever took place on a mountain side or in a cave? Have Jupiter and Mars become so senile?

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -10 points • 19 April, 2016 07:42 PM

I agree. Women are disgusting stupid whores with no empathy, love or any care besides their own fun and amusement, and their own agenda.

However, how do you feel about your wife? Do you just put up with her or?

Also, you should make a blog. I'm a big fan of your writings, good shit. The men of redpill need to get rid of this idea that women like nice alphas.

CornyHoosier • 9 points • 19 April, 2016 09:34 PM

Bro, you might be letting your anger grip you a little too tight.

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 April, 2016 09:38 PM

I'm not angry. I'm calm. Just not delusional about women.

snowdude\_fz • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 01:14 AM

You know a lot of Amish youth go out into the world before getting married right? Don't kid yourself, those Amish girls don't come back virgins.

[deleted] • 19 points • 19 April, 2016 11:21 PM

1. Women didn't fight for anything. They were bought paid and manipulated by the western elites looking to destabilize the nuclear family. It worked. Women are gullible. It's their fatal flaw.
2. Don't do anything to get women or make women want you. You don't get rich you get powerful and the money comes. Become a great men, someone who betters the world and leads it to a higher place and women will naturally come. They want to be lead.

ReTToC • 15 points • 19 April, 2016 09:26 PM

All well and good. However, the true nature of women lies in fear. Women are literally afraid of everything. Their entire existence is consumed by it. Their feckless feeble frames are a target and could be taken by a predator effortlessly at anytime. This is understood by man and even betas but it is difficult to fully grasp the depth of their situation. Luckily for females as well as males, in the USA, we live in a civil society, governed by the rule of law. If you want to see the true nature of women and their existence we can look to many parts of the Middle East. The true nature of a woman is to be a slave to man. This is not my view on how I think women should be treated and living in society but this is the reality of the true nature of women. So looking at the existence of women, in a lawless barbaric society, we get to the core of their psyche and the true essence of what they always know in the back of their mind could be.

Archwinger[S] • 21 points • 19 April, 2016 10:15 PM

Very true. Men are stronger than women. The only reason a woman can walk from point A to point B safely is because men let it happen. Men choose not to rape, rob, or kill her, whether it's because they feel a moral obligation or because they want to avoid the consequence of other men that will jail them or kick their asses. The only reason women have any power at all is because men let them. All female power is an illusion. Men playing along. And any man at any time might say to hell with this and stop playing along. Women live in constant fear of that.

ReTTToCcomment score below threshold • -5 points • 19 April, 2016 11:50 PM

Your 2nd point is is completely off kilter in modern society. We have entered a new age or Renaissance if you will in human evolution. The battle is no longer brute force. We are fighting a battle of the minds. Anyone with a computer can build the next billion dollar company no matter their race, genitale, strength, charisma or attractiveness.

tallwheel • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 01:55 AM

I think Archwinger's point is exactly that. Modern society is the only thing keeping that true. The fact that men as a whole have decided that we should protect women and not rape or beat them is the only thing motivating individual men who might otherwise be violent brutes to uphold those rules.

You're right, though, that in the practical sense one man does not have the power to change modern society, so he must play the current game of power that we find ourselves in. A smart rich man is far more powerful in today's society than a physically strong poor man.

I think the other point of the posts above is that women still live with the instinct that tells them that at any time one crazy strong poor man has the potential to rape or beat her in a dark alley somewhere. Her instincts are not wrong, it's just that the odds of such things actually happening have become increasingly unlikely.

tompanz • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 07:22 AM

A Renaissance? Do you seriously believe that? Have you been outside recently? I don't mean that to be rude, I just don't understand how you could come to the conclusion that we are in anything but a decline. Where do you live?

We are living on the cusp of the greatest societal collapse we have (probably) ever seen. Unless we shit out the singularity within the next decade, or all our magical technology will just be myths told around camp fires in a century.

ReTTToC • 0 points • 20 April, 2016 12:00 PM

Are you not entertained! You would have to be Helen Keller not to understand what is going on

all around. The link between art, science, communication, and technology that man has created is so mindboggling that you would think we are living in a fictional world compared to just a few decades ago. You literally have everything and anything available at your disposal in real time.

I live in America. The only thing leading to our decline is the government's fiscal and monetary policies as they pillage and plunder the full faith and credit of the dollar driving us deeper and deeper into insolvency.

You sound like a bitter malcontent Beta loser and a damn fool. We are actually living on the cusp of the greatest societal ascendancy ever possible. With the slightest bit of hunger and passion you can do or create anything on the Internet. You are connected to the world. There are kids becoming multi millionaires and billionaires over night. Look at Mark Zuckerberg, this guy basically just became the richest man in the world offering a free services.

I do believe America is at the height of the Roman Empire. This is a very sad state of affairs due to greatness and growth I can foresee on the horizon. With that being said, our demise and fall will be due to government intervention not the ingenuity, spirit, and creativity of the American people and the free market.

[deleted] • 6 points • 19 April, 2016 10:47 PM

The true relationship between man and woman should not be captain and first mate, but slave and master. Women love to be treated inferior, because it tells her you are superior. Men are superior beings and women revel in masculinity and male superiority, they love it. If women are not 100% controlled by men at all times and subjugated by men at all times, a society cannot flourish. Women having any rights besides being reproductive cattle equals death to a society. Women cannot have rights for a society to flourish. Plus women love being subjugated.

"If you look at her and see anything besides emptiness, fear and emotional hunger, you are looking at the parts of yourself which have been consumed to that point." - Dave Sim

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 03:24 AM

This is acutely true. We allow them to play at autonomy to our own detriment. Their wishes/aspirations shouldn't even factor into the equation. It only changes when we as men navigate our female progeny in the way they need to go. Too many redpill men carving special snowflake daughters who somehow feel they're entitled to dabble in professional endeavors. We should be sabotaging, cock blocking and outright forbidding their ambition at every level. It doesn't matter two fucks if they didn't like being dependent in previous generations. The only difference now is that when we send them back to the kitchens they've abdicated we aint putting their fucking pussies on a pedestal because we don't like them now either. They need to fuck and serve. That's it. Their fulfillment means, quite literally nothing and their ambitions are 100% deleterious to men in every regard. They exist to create more men and to create more vaginas/housekeepers for those men.

[deleted] • 6 points • 20 April, 2016 03:31 AM

Exactly. Women exist to serve, fuck, and reproduce. These redpill men who think their daughters are going to be any different than the hypergamous sluts the rest of the female gender are, are sorely mistaken. AWALT. Women need to be dependent on men in order for society to flourish. Or be subjugated, or enslaved by men. Same difference. Women are not happy when you care about their needs or indulge their whims. Do what you want, do what makes you happy. That what makes her happy. Women have no ambitions besides acquiring power through alpha and providing for themselves and offspring. Women should not be treated as men, they do not belong in school or the

workplace. They are a detriment to male learning.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 03:34 AM

Punish ambition in female children and 90% of all societal ills cease to exist.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 03:36 AM

Women need to know their place as inferior for there to be any Hope in a successful civilization. Explain more of that though, I kind of agree but I'm interested in hearing more.

[deleted] • -4 points • 22 April, 2016 01:23 PM

It's simple really. Once fathers start punishing competitiveness in their daughters by reinforcing the hard truths that they are incapable of EVER winning per their own merits in anything, but they are humored by men and boys who let them win at things because they want what's between their legs and that you won't tolerate that kind of dishonest achievement under your roof. When fathers mandate without exception that their little girls are only allowed to play with dolls and toy stoves and toy cleaning items and they stop allowing them to play with their brothers chemistry sets, their roles can finally be reingrained. They are to be brought up servile and submissive and chastised for interjecting strong opinions over their brothers. Let her know what her very quantifiable intellectual deficits are and let her know that's ok. Let her know the entirety of her value rests in her obedience and nurturing along with her purity. It amazes me that men don't love their daughters enough to stand up to their insane feminist aspirations. It's a no brainer. Women have limited and very specific worth. Gaurd that shit and cultivate it for her benefit. Deep down every man knows the last thing we need is another female cardio thoracic surgeon and its offensive to encourage female children to dream big grrrl-power delusional fantasies anymore. It needs to start in the home. No one should bat an eyelash when little Suzy no longer has a choice in whether or not she gets to go to college. The answer is no. Why are fathers paying 50K for their daughters to cull dick? Women don't learn for the sake of learning and their only hobbies and interests are fucked into them - let her husband determine what music, cinema, sports, pastimes and food she likes, not the local frat house.

[deleted] • -1 points • 22 April, 2016 01:35 PM\*

I agree completely. Good convo. Women need to relearn their place as the reproductive gender, and sex slaves. And nothing makes a woman happier than her feminine primal natural state: subservience to man. Nothing makes a woman happier than subservience and enslavement to an alpha male. Treat her lower than dirt and shell love you.

Except for exceptionally brilliant gifted women, women should be bred as cattle for reproduction. Women's value comes from their womb & pussy. Without those they're just inferior versions of men. Sex and kids is all most women exist for. All of life is pretty much just DNA fighting to replicate itself into the next generation. All of life is every organism fighting for the right to exist. Adapt or die.

Well108 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:21 AM

If you look at her and see anything besides emptiness, fear and emotional hunger, you are looking at

the parts of yourself which have been consumed to that point

I'm trying to wrap my head around that quote. Is this the same as the "she's your mirror?"

[deleted] • 4 points • 20 April, 2016 03:23 AM

Nah. Its saying if you see any qualities resembelling your own and not typical hypergamic female behavior, its because she's absorbed those qualities from being around you so much.

A lot of women don't have real personalities. They just become the female versions of the dudes they're fucking.

Wel108 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:45 AM

It's true, and i agree that this holds true to many. But I will say that, one of my current plates is super, super mentally strong on her views. Typical feminist. I can't imagine even trying to be with that woman. What's funny is that she wants to have a traditional marriage, yet she has no clue what that actually entails.

FieldLine • 27 points • 19 April, 2016 06:52 PM\*

If a woman chooses to be a non-slut, faithful, cultivate good marriage traits, or date decent guys, this isn't a biological drive. We like to call those good behaviors "feminine" traits, but they're actually the opposite of female nature. They're a conscious choice to go against a woman's nature for personal gain.

Is this true though? My understanding was that in the long run women today are *less* happy than they used to be because they're going against their natural instincts (i.e. nurturing, acting what we call "feminine") by whoring around. You're arguing the opposite.

It's a woman's true nature to be slutty, unfaithful, a shitty marriage prospect, and attracted to cads. Unless the consequences for that behavior outweigh the fun. Remove the consequences, and we see their true nature.

I don't think the typical modern woman's behavior indicates her true nature. It simply demonstrates impulsiveness and a lack of judgement which used to be curbed by what you describe above.

The whole reason women are attracted to dominant men is because they do well when they are submissive to someone/something larger, whether that is man with his shit together or a religious society.

Archwinger[S] • 21 points • 19 April, 2016 07:03 PM

There's an inherent conflict between what's we want to do and what's best for us. In many cases, what we want to do is really our "nature", while what's best for us is more of a societal construct.

If we were still animals living in the woods, and civilization didn't exist, the things we innately do in the absence of judgment and consequences would align a lot more closely with what's best for us.

But in society, the things that are best for us, long-term, aren't always the things that we impulsively want to do. Society constrains our nature. We have to fight our nature to fit into society.

TheReformist94 • 6 points • 19 April, 2016 09:24 PM

Woman's nature is not commitment like TRP preaches.relationships are shackles for women.the only people who truly love and have loyalty are men.they enjoy riding the CC and that's it. Think they like nurturing and children? Go to an abortion clinic where girls in their early 20s stroll out having had an abortion when the morning after pill fails

tompanz • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 07:15 AM

They do that because they think they will have time later, and young pregnancies are seen as "faux pas". I don't know where you're getting this idea that women don't like babies, they *fucking love* babies. They obsess over them, they pick out names decades(lol) before they plan on having one, they gather around babies and coo at them like idiots. Every woman I've talked to one doesn't have a baby, they seem to try very hard to convince themselves that they don't want one yet. They legitimately think they can have a baby when their "careers" are in a good spot, which is never.

You even forget that a large subset of women are pro-life, and are even willing to give birth to tards and (actual) rape babies. If women love anything in this world, they love babies.

phamousTRP • 1 point • 21 April, 2016 04:27 AM

I think it's definitely a mixed bag. Women have the capacity to love their own children. Women can also be nurtured into being more nurturing and traditionally feminine. However, if they are without children of their own, most women seem to love the *idea* of babies and children. Actually loving babies and children isn't in their nature unless they give birth to their own child. Loving babies can be in their nurture but with all social changes and lack of strong fathers and traditional mothers that nurture can't be counted on.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 10:43 PM

Agree completely, although I know my mom loves me. Besides maybe their offspring, women have no loyalty or love, or empathy. They aren't capable of it.

Battle-Scars • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 03:12 AM

Does your mom know you think she is a whore and a slut?

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:15 AM

Nah, but she knows I think most other women are whores. Do I think my mom is a whore now? Nah, she's probably too old to get anybody interested. Was she when she was young? Oh yeah, most likely. My mother isn't a unicorn. I love her, but she most likely rode the cc like all other women.

optica • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:39 AM

Are we by nature social or political animals? If yes, then FieldLine is probably right. We find true happiness or fulfillment in well-ordered families, communities, etc. This is the view of the classics (Plato, Aristotle).

Or are we all radically individual and society is an external constraint on our natural impulses from which we need to be liberated? Is society essentially bad for us? This is the view of some modern philosophers (cf. esp. Rousseau).

Code\_Bordeauxx • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:22 PM

I felt compelled to respond to this, because you're touching upon an essential nuance to your post. Yet the way I'm reading into your comment makes me believe you've got it backwards.

Agreed, there is a conflict between what we want (short term) and what is best for us (long term). This goes for both sexes, but because men have a stronger aptitude for logic and reason, it's only natural to men that what's best for us (and women) even crosses our minds. What I'm trying to say is that women have always relied on men to suppress their nature and guide them towards the outcome that's best for them.

It's not that women need to suppress their nature to get what's best for them *in our modern society*, it's that they need to suppress their nature to get what's best for them, period. Modern society is (was?) a construct built to facilitate this. Stability, protection, hell, all the inventions that make our lives easier, longer and healthier, women are ultimately far better off in this situation. But it's not because of them that we got here.

Chris\_Phoenix • 21 points • 19 April, 2016 07:43 PM

"quit reminiscing about the good old days. Women weren't any better then. We just chained them up and pretended they were." Glad someone finally said it. I've always felt the community romanticized the "good old days" because it cushioned the blow, gave them something to believe in. But pretty lies aren't what we spread here, they're what we kill

PantsonFire1234 • 9 points • 19 April, 2016 10:29 PM

I'm not against women being allowed to be free and freaky. Honestly I think everyone should at least get that choice even if they can't handle that freedom.

What I do have a problem with is women trying to flip the game and imprison the man both financially and emotionally. I want none of that obligated fear and guilt women throw around. It's all great that their allowed to do what they want right now..

.. But nothing comes with a price, the price is that men now equally can do what they want. Back in the old days a provider wouldn't ditch his wife. Nowadays I see no problem with men abandoning women when it best suits them. Cheat when it best suits them and lie when it best suits them.

The idea of a game is that both sides play by the same rules. You can change the rules that's fine. But it changes for **both** sides.

Trying to bend reality and pretend like men need to uphold rules women don't won't fly for me.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 11:00 PM

Women don't uphold or follow rules unless men force them to. They have no morals or foresight, they chase tingles which equals chaos. Since women chase chaos because it gives them tingles and are irrational, they keep things from ever being stable. Which means if women are not constantly in a state of slavery of submission and slavery to men, chaos ensues and stability disappears.

redolas • 1 point • 22 April, 2016 08:25 PM

Chaos is not bad. The universe is chaos. Nature is chaos. Humankind did appear from chaos. Just because you live in a city, it doesn't mean the world isn't chaos. All our rules mean nothing and do nothing. How do you know that a world without rules isn't a better world?

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 08:21 PM

Good post but how would this fit in with those of us that want to start families? The one thing I really struggle with when it comes to TRP is how "enjoying the decline" is a phrase often repeated as a way of life. As someone who somewhat got fucked up by growing up in a broken household, I have observed that kids are healthiest with an old fashioned up bringing where the parents are together and involved.

I guess a better way to phrase my question is this: is it natural for women to submit to and be loyal to a patriarch and follow his lead for the sake of the survival of the species, but also because she naturally desires that? Or is sluttiness and disloyalty always an unavoidable outcome regardless of how alpha the male is?

Archwinger[S] • 20 points • 19 April, 2016 08:33 PM\*

Women will act in their own interests. If being married to an awesome, badass man and having his children is clearly, hands down, 100% her best course of action that benefits her the most, she'll do that.

But boy, do you have to be one hell of a badass man to pull that off.

Because when you marry a woman, you've essentially put your balls in her hands, and not in a sexy way. Any time she wants, for any reason or no reason at all, including she just got bored and decided to start fucking someone else, she can cash out of the marriage. She gets your children, your house, half of your assets (or more), and a chunk of all of your future earnings for the foreseeable future.

The second you commit to her, she has all of the power. She doesn't have to fuck you, hold a job, do any work in the house, care effectively for the kids, be financially responsible, or treat you with the slightest ounce of respect. Or even remain faithful. What are you going to do about it? Give her your kids and money?

You're counting on her being a good person and doing the right thing, simply because you're so awesome -- more awesome than any other man she can ever get. Her finger's on the nuke button for the rest of your life, but as long as a divorce is more inconvenient and socially awkward than it's worth and you're still awesome enough. She won't push the button. At least not today.

--Edog-- • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 10:12 PM

When you marry a woman she also has the power to make your life miserable with bad behavior, complaining, dead bedroom and so on. Getting married is a very dangerous move for a man, it's really just a decision for a woman.

MattyAnon • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 01:33 PM

| She won't push the button. At least not today.

However... it does drive up her entitlement. And decrease your value. And she'll find a way to negotiate this to being a better deal for her... often simply by not having sex with you, then negotiating for its return. Gradually ratchetting up the man's efforts each time she goes round that loop. And as u/Archwinger says.... what you gonna do, hand her your children and your money to leave?

## **Do Not Marry**

(And sorry if you are already)

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 07:48 PM

Seems all you need is to change the marriage laws.

[deleted] • 9 points • 19 April, 2016 08:29 PM

Sluttiness is unavoidable no matter how alpha you are.

eddiae • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 09:39 PM

just get her pregnant and she'll get a beta to raise it for you, otherwise you'll have to hide assets carefully if you're rich since she'll inevitably divorce you or disrespect you through cheating after a few years

Wilreadit • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:21 AM

Never get her pregnant. Because if she is even remotely smart, she will fuck the house and half your assets out of you before you even know it.

That is unless you are a worthless shmuck in which case she is dumb for getting pregnant with you in the first place.

MAX\_Fury • 4 points • 19 April, 2016 08:53 PM

bro didn't you know, you are not supposed to have a family in this day and age, you are just supposed to pump and dump every woman bc they are all sluts. You are supposed to work and use that money on yourself and spend it in any way you want. Then grow old and die. Thats a satisfying life right there.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 09:04 PM

I'm gonna do just that, but instead im gonna have children with surrogates.

Wilreadit • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:22 AM

You may be sarcastic, but that life suits me just fine.

VasilyZaitzev • 8 points • 20 April, 2016 02:53 AM

This just in: Be the best YOU that you can be. Make yourself exceptional, and the pussy will flow. It's like happiness; if you don't go seeking it specifically, you're more likely to wind up finding it.

redarkane • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 02:07 PM

Exactly.. I don't see why TRP is preaching us bending over backwards to seem appetizing for them. We should be the best version of ourselves for our sake. If they want to hop along for the ride, cool. If not, fuck em. There's so much more to life than just fucking and relationships with women. Go on a hike with friends and just clear your head people..you don't need to change for a woman.

kryptokate • 16 points • 19 April, 2016 11:27 PM **[recovered]**

No women are not better or more selfless or more moral or more pure than men. No women don't like being chaste and having to marry a schlub and serve him, they want excitement and novelty and hot sex just like men. Women just had to do that because they had no other choice. Yes, this is what feminists have been saying since the 60s.

Good fucking lord, unbelievable it has taken 50 years for this to sink in.

Newsflash: women don't like being monogamous and chaste whilst men get to spread it around. Women don't like having to smile and act "sweet" (read: subordinate) and look attractive while men don't have to. We do that shit if we have to, no other reason.

Newsflash: employees don't naturally WANT to suck up to their boss and compliment their boss and smile and act servile. They do it because they have to, no other reason.

Newsflash: 200 years ago, black people didn't enjoy having to smile and dance and shuffle and entertain and kiss up to white people. They did it because they had to, no other reason.

NO ONE is selfless, everyone enjoys pleasure and respect and status and sex. Everyone would rather lord it over others than have someone lord it over them. Everyone would rather that someone else be submissive, deferential, humiliated, and servile, rather than having to be those things. Everyone wants the freedom to be slutty while everyone else is chaste. Everyone wants to be unconditionally loved and adored, while everyone else should look, smell, act, and be perfectly attractive at all times. This is called HUMAN NATURE.

The only reason anyone ever compromises on these things is because it's a necessary trade off, because others have power over them. Not because they just ENJOY being humble, meek, chaste, and serving others. Lol, seriously how fucking dumb can someone be to ever believe that?

It's hilarious -- when it isn't sad as fuck -- how those in power manage to truly, deeply convince themselves that in fact it isn't that they're exercising power over and restraining others, but that those others just naturally want to be servile and act in the powerful one's benefit. Bosses tend to believe that their employees actually like them, when really most people hate their boss. White people used to believe that black people just naturally accepted and enjoyed serving whites because it was "natural". And apparently men really convinced themselves that women just really LIKED acting like subordinate/servant/maid/exclusive prostitutes to one male because it was just so natural and fun for them. Lol!

Big news, I know. Women enjoy pleasure and status just like men. They're lazy and greedy and sexually voracious, just like men. OMG the horrors. They have the same selfish and self-aggrandizing and hedonistic desires and wants and hopes and displeasures, they're just smaller and weaker and can get pregnant, which creates different circumstances. But yeah, women revel in fantasies of power and unlimited interest by attractive members of the opposite sex and the respect and admiration of peers too. I don't understand why this whole elaborate "red pill" construction is necessary when all that is necessary to understand women is to understand that ALL humans are self-interested animals, nothing more or less.

I can't imagine how this has ever been anything but blatantly obvious. Apparently taking the perspective of others is not the strong suit of many in this forum. Many of you seem to have denied the obvious reality in favor of your preferred fantasies all the way until it your face was rubbed so hard into the truth that you could no longer deny it. As far as I can tell, the real reason it was surprising to anyone on this forum is because they were raised with religious delusions. Absent religious myths that pretend humans are not animals, this shit is pretty damn obvious (yet you're still getting disagreements here...people do love their fantasies).

redolas • 5 points • 20 April, 2016 12:12 AM

You said it a lot better than me.

The red pill has a bias against feminism, and I accept that. The social contract is biased against men. Agree again.

But, as we now understand women's nature, why not have a better world for both genders?! On the one hand we are proud to be alpha, on the other hand we're complaining that women are slutty and don't stay true to their beta husbands. Yes, we are alpha, and yes, we should not care that women fuck other men. Because that's our nature. HUMAN nature.

Wel108 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:36 AM

I don't think it's fair to say that this one post about women nature and the fact that many people haven't understood that this is human nature, is indicative of the entire Red Pill community and what it's about. If anything, what i've gotten from this community is more along the lines of being masculine, becoming a powerful man, finding happiness within yourself, instead of trying to find happiness in a relationship.

Also, I think one of the biggest things I've taken from RP is that women are emotional creatures that don't act with logic and rational thinking. I was raised religious with traditional views, so it was difficult for me personally. But this is more about learning how to manage your woman, understanding their emotional behaviors, and how to properly deal with said behaviors. I believe if you truly immerse yourself in TRP, you'll find that it would drastically help you maintain a LTR if that's what you so please.

landon042 • 6 points • 19 April, 2016 09:24 PM [recovered]

highschooler. and wanted to share this.

Just today at lunch we have a table, some girls cute. I haven't tried game or anything as I'm usually quiet at lunch. So this girl(not bitch or anything) puts fork on my plate then turns back to her friend,because they were talking.

some of you may think oh god people over analyze everything.

but this girl did a subconscious shit test physically like the "hold my purse at the mall" I said no, no no. took it off and set it down to her. the look on her friends face was priceless, she looked like a little girl ready to take my dick because she knows what has just happend and I showed alpha traits(not taking shit for anyone) whilst she ask another guy to take it, notice the other guy isn't some incel, he's on sports team popular, but failed this compliance test and happily went to throw it away. It's things people don't really notice but this shit happens all the time.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 01:13 AM

good job noticing. You are on the path to success.

Letsbeserioushere • 5 points • 19 April, 2016 09:52 PM

Don't be someone they need, be someone they want

I'd take this a step further and say be someone who **you** want. Otherwise, by corollary, the implication is that your measure of success is defined by women, and the extent to which they want you.

Nice Guy Syndrome stems from this belief, that if you act in a certain way, you will reap the benefits of another person's respect/gratitude/whatever. To eradicate it, you have to throw away with these contingencies ("*If I do X, then surely she'll Y..*").

Of course the irony is that women want men who want these things for themselves, not for the sake of women. Perhaps I'm pointing out an obvious distinction, but when this clicked in my head, everything made more sense. Great post. Interested to hear your thoughts on this.

Archwinger[S] • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 10:10 PM

It's really a waste of time to brazenly declare, "I don't care what anybody else thinks of me!"

Of course you do. Society judges all of us. Other people determine whether you get a job interview, whether you get hired, how much to pay you, whether you get raises or promotions, and whether you get fired. Other people determine whether you get followed around in an expensive store. Other people determine whether to recommend you to somebody else for something. Other people determine whether they're going hang out with you, be you friend, or if they're going to fuck you or not.

OF COURSE other people's opinions of you matter. They affect whether or not you get ahead in life.

Sitting alone in your basement, never getting laid and never getting ahead, but proudly typing on the internet that you were "true to yourself", like that has some kind of value, is loser talk. Mental masturbation.

Letsbeserioushere • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:45 AM

My point isn't a justification for being a loser. I agree with everything you've said about other people's opinions, but that's not what I meant.

After thinking about it for a while, the point I'm making is too subtle to be of any practical relevance. No point wasting time with theoretical platitudes.

Thank you for your response.

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 April, 2016 08:05 PM

Definitely keep working your ass off and making bank, but save that money. Spend it on shit you like. Maybe retire early. Don't let the girls know you're doing well financially. I won't tell.

Telling your wife you have money is basically entrapping her to divorce you. Don't get married, and if you do don't let her know how much cash you have stored up. Better yet, don't keep it as cash.

Wilreadit • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:26 AM

The clever way to go about this is to incorporate it as a trust. So you own nothing and control everything.

MAX\_Fury • 4 points • 19 April, 2016 08:32 PM

so.. seeing that there is no hope at all for any LTR no matter how alpha u are, what are we supposed to do, go on with our entire lives fucking sluts, get random chicks pregnant then disappear and let the beta take care of your spawn.. which most likely will end up in jail bc he or she will live in a single mother home while we move up the corporate ladder and make bank and save up and use that money on solely us and spend it in any way we desire. Then grow old and die. I suppose thats not a bad life.

RED\_PILL\_TRUTH • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 09:50 PM

Nobody ever says don't LTR on here. I plan on having several long and fulfilling LTR's in my lifetime- I'm currently in a year plus one right now. But what most people are saying if you get married and give a woman in the 21st century "the nuke button" as Archwinger stated, odds are it's going to end up far worse for you than the situation you just painted.

MAX\_Fury • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 10:11 PM

actually majority of the people on here tell everyone not to LTR, are you pertaining to only this post or all of the trp content

NeoreactionSafe • 15 points • 19 April, 2016 07:01 PM\*

This can be hard for a beta to hear, so they don't like it.

Here is a better way to look at it...

Focus on your **masculine polarity**.

There was never any honor in being a provider... the only time there was honor was when men were truly Free men and capable of **private ownership**. The family was a man's private property and we've lost that to bad laws. As the world becomes feminized it's Freedom, the concept of private ownership, Frame and secrecy that all fall into decline.

So reverse all that.

Become Free in your mind.

Hold secrets that have no purpose other than your own *private gag real*.

Own what things the globalists allow you to own... which is less and less.

redolas • 4 points • 20 April, 2016 12:39 AM

Better yet. Own nothing but your life. Live free. Nobody can take away anything you don't have.

Globalists have power over us not because we don't have. They have power because we have things that can be taken away. A traveler is always free to find a job/food/shelter somewhere else. A homeowner can't move his house, he is stuck.

NeoreactionSafe • 4 points • 20 April, 2016 02:52 AM

A very good point.

Actually materialism has become part of the trap.

It's not the 1800's anymore, even when you own a home you are taxed so heavily that it can sometimes be cheaper to simply rent.

Imagine a world where there were effectively:

No significant property taxes.

No income taxes.

No sales taxes or very low.

...taxation was once so insignificant as to be a non-issue while today you end up paying 35% or more just for a moderate income.

WhoresloverPhat • 11 points • 19 April, 2016 09:28 PM [recovered]

Start being someone she wants.

And start giving women what they want, not what they need.

Your semantics are BP.

Be someone YOU want to be. Giving women what they need, is still serving women. Do these things *for you*.

I don't get ripped because ladies like it, I do it because I like to be capable and strong.

I'm not fun because I want to get laid, I enjoy being and having fun - even when alone.

Being socially apt is important for me to get all the things I want, including women.

The language you internally use has important implications, I do not think you should frame your RP intentions as serving women with wants or needs - it is about serving yourself, with some vagina on the side.

Archwinger[S] • 12 points • 19 April, 2016 10:18 PM

When I read your resume, I decide whether you get an interview. It doesn't matter what you think of yourself. It matters what I think of you.

When we interview, you'd damn well better tailor your words and actions to what you think I want, or you're not getting hired. What I think of you matters. Not what you think of yourself.

Other people determine whether or not you're successful. Other people determine whether or not you have friends, whether or not you get laid, whether or not you make money. You live and die by what other people think about you.

There's no inherent value in "doing it for myself" or "being true to myself". That's loser talk. That's what someone who fails at life says to comfort himself. "I may have sucked at everything, but at least I was always true to myself."

Successful people care what others think about them.

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 April, 2016 10:50 PM

I care about what people think because it serves my purposes to have a good image, but they have no effect on my self esteem. I don't care about their opinions personally, just business-wise or socially.

Archwinger[S] • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 10:55 PM

Said another way, you care about someone else to the extent that he or she has power over you. If somebody is powerless, what he or she thinks is meaningless. If you're the powerful one, it's other people who worry about what you think.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 11:04 PM

Exactly. Let's say the CEO of Sony might be giving me a job. He thinks I'm a stupid arrogant asshole. Does his opinion affect me on a personal level? No, I don't give a fuck. Does his opinion affect me on a business/social level? Yes, because I want the job and if he doesn't like me, I might not get it. So in a way I do care because he has power over me. But I don't take it personally. I just adjust and adapt to the situation. I want to be liked so I can have more opportunities and more power, but it has no effect on me personally if I'm not liked. I like being liked cause it gives me more options, but being liked has no barrier on my self esteem. My self esteem is always on a constant positive feedback loop.

EntitledShitHead • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 04:37 AM

There's no inherent value in "doing it for myself" or "being true to myself". That's loser talk. That's what someone who fails at life says to comfort himself. "I may have sucked at everything, but at least I was always true to myself."

I've been thinking a lot about this lately, especially after reading the 38th law of the 48 powers of law. Some of the most alpha people I know and Senior Endorsed Contributors tell me that when you do things for yourself, there's a sort of boldness to you, and you might make a few enemies, but you also create an image which is more important in the long run. And plus being inner-direct is more important.

If you're in a room of Bernie supporters, and they ask you who you voted for, do you respond Trump or lie and say Bernie? If you say Trump, you lose out on some possible friendships (most college students think that if you believe anything different than they do, you are a racist, sexist, etc.) and connections. So, you lose out on some connections. If you say Bernie, you can play it so that with your TRP knowledge you rise to the top of the hierarchy of that group. What would you do?

royal\_fucktard • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 08:07 PM

This is a great post. It explains No More Mr. Nice Guy in a few paragraphs. It wasn't until I was through the anger phase that this message finally resonated. The change that came after internalizing this has been one of the best things that has ever happened to me.

EdvardMunch • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 09:20 PM

I'm glad I read this post. Lately I've been dealing with rejection, or at least the appearance thereof. It's strange to me because all I ever hear about is my looks, how I'm a man whore, etc. Girls rarely make eye contact and sometimes act weird around me. I usually take it to be negative even though it isn't in every case.

I quit spinning plates, thought about LTR but the girl I was into only broke up with her beta bf to have sex with me for a few weeks before going back to him because he lets her control everything. The sad truth is as much as being a redpill or alpha man is great, it also means you might never have a long term partner who values you for comfort.

I don't see the difference between being a beta bitch and an alpha whose cock she wants. One isn't better than the other. You might get your freedom, you might keep your dignity somewhat, but at the end of the day we are all serving an end to someone's desire.

I would really appreciate knowing the answer to being a man with high smv who is also wanted as a partner. You guys speak of this but I've rarely seen it. Girls don't trust me and every time I bed them they talk of how many other girls I must have. I'm I suppose to argue having too high of an smv is bad? I'm a cheater before I cheat, and I'm not who they imagined if I extinguish those fears. I often feel like i'm never really beta or ever really alpha, therefore I serve no purpose. I'm better off being the guy they can cheat on their bf with, and they do. Most girls I've met with have admitted, have cheated, or are willing to cheat.

While I appreciate this advice, I don't want to be a human dildo.

tallwheel • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:45 AM

Alpha bux is difficult to achieve, and I like to believe that it is possible, but the usual precautions apply. In today's world even an alpha bux needs to be constantly in the game and remaining awesome. And even if he does, there is always still a chance that his hot wife who "needs him" will decide to jump on some other guy's cock for whatever reason.

Follow the alpha bux path if you want, but do whatever you can to protect yourself, and always keep in mind that nothing lasts forever.

Wilreadit • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:29 AM

The whole point of RP is not that you get some magic ability to control *ALL* women. No. RP is to make sure you can take care of yourself by knowing how different women are.

The point here is RP is not to trap women, but to help you not get trapped by them. A strategy that won't destroy you.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 April, 2016 10:55 PM

You are a human dildo. Get the fuck over it. Women do not care about you, and they never will. All you are to them is tingles, a potential provider, a dildo, an emotional tampon & a wallet. They will never love you. Come to terms with it and be comfortable with just fucking.

They hate the comfort. Comfort kills tingles.

EdvardMunch • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 12:44 AM

Why the hell go through all this process then. Why not talk of a lot of this as how to fuck girls and keep them coming back for more.

[deleted] • -1 points • 20 April, 2016 12:47 AM

Exactly. Just fuck them. That is what the redpill is mainly for. Keep them coming back for more, keep fucking them. Never commit. Never trust. Never love.

Wilreadit • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 04:33 AM

No. They want the comfort and the tingles. Not necessarily in the same dude though.

They are indisciplined. They will want whatever they crave and there is no rational explanation why.

Why do chicks who have a rich alpha BF fuck the pool boy. Why do chicks who are married to some 9-5 shmuck fuck their boss?

It is like, tasting a different flavor of ice cream everytime you go to a ice cream shop.

lumberjackinla • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 10:21 PM

You dont have to be the provider,because daddy government is right there to protect her. This is the true reality.

Scrawler357 • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 10:53 PM

This is especially true of the stereotypical 50's housewife that purple pillers yearn for. These 50's women were born and grew up in the terrifying shadow of the great depression, where having a roof over your head and food on the table and having a man who was employed was the apex of hypergamy. The same as many 3rd world countries now. It all changed in the swinging 60's mentality, just the same as 3rd world wives change after they're imported and acclimatized to western ideas.

BimboChristie69 • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 11:50 PM

Be the man which woman wants to fuck

introvertp • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 02:56 AM

"Be what she WANTS, not what she needs." I said that the other day in a reply to another thread and came back to a bunch of down-votes. Thank you for further clarifying this mindset.

A few years ago a car got you laid, now I see more females than males behind the wheel. They have money, they have apartments and all that. They don't need us for materialistic things, like that, anymore.

~

Dudes are trying to provide for her, make her lust for you.

Don't just get shredded. Wear good fitted clothes. If you're not getting "sexy" comments or girls straight up objectify you try again. Be a fun person to be around, flirt, build tension.

Even when things are getting stale with your plate(s), tell them to come over then both of you leave the house. It doesn't matter where you take them just build some serious sexual tension there. Feel her up when no one is looking, whisper how you'll fuck her when you get home, do some dread game and watch her get dick crazy.

Veritas\_potissimum • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 12:54 PM

Here's an uncomfortable reality. Back in the "good ol' days", a lot of women weren't happy. Women didn't avoid promiscuity, marry at a young age to good-provider nice-guys, and stay in that situation for the rest of their lives because it was their greatest fantasy and their deepest want, due to their innate female natures. They did this because they didn't have any other choice. Women were financially dependent upon men, and if they wanted to avoid social ostracization, starvation, and failure, they'd pair off with a good provider and stick with him.

How do you know that women are happier now with even more decisions of how they can live their lives? I strongly disagree with this point and there is a wealth of evidence that suggests women are now unhappier than ever simply because they are pushed into a decision making frame and they hate it let alone making all kinds of wrong decisions and only realizing too late in life the housewife role would probably fit most of them. Don't buy into the same propaganda women are buying into - they need to be shown the way and that is with males making the decisions, not the women.

Archwinger[S] • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 01:00 PM

Women are much unhappier now. Being a man is way harder than being a woman. Trying to be men when they're not men is even harder than that.

The fact that women are even less happy now doesn't mean women were happy back then, though.

UrsusG • 6 points • 19 April, 2016 08:31 PM\*

Great post.

Excellent summary of underlying truths, causes, effects, plus guidance on what to do with this information.

If it were up to me, I'd put this in the sidebar.

RED\_PILL\_TRUTH • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 09:46 PM

I agree, I think this is one of the most profound pieces of writing we've had on here all year.

eddiae • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 09:30 PM

indeed, you hit the nail on the head here, i always thought that women left to themselves would go on a giant dopamine rush of yolo behavior and would still think it was worth it when their looks fall off, getting beta bucks is mainly icing on the cake for them they'll happily do it again even without them, as a modern man you have no other choice but to join the winning top dogs and live only and solely for yourself and your goals.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 10:16 PM

Men also aren't really productive without giving consequences to their laziness. In this age only alpha fathers can encourage boys to become men, that and the manosphere.

You don't hate a hungry bear for chasing you. You shoot him and be done. Women don't hate you for being a beta. They just exploit you. Alphas don't hate women for being women. They just fuck them.

What i mean is, yes people on a basic level are terrible, you don't hate on them, you just get better - and thrive in their hate.

This is a thing women catch up very early in their life, setting the tone for us. Don't hate on her for being a basic bitch ( or an evolved one, aka ltr material, whatever ), acknowledge her basic shittyness from the start and lead her better. Or pump and pump. The core is, you must accept people basic shittyness before you can overcome the anger.

poetryright123 • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 11:17 PM **[recovered]**

All good points but remember the lesson taught in the Brainwashed documentaries. Although women in Norway have all the opportunity in the world to become anything they want most fall back to stereotypes like nurses. So I would suspect that what women did to survive for thousands, choosing good providers, probably still at least impacts their mate choice today. And also I believe in the Brainwashed documentaries they established that the average woman is not interested in casual sex. I think they presented a study that 50% of women found the experience of a one night stand as being unsatisfying.

[deleted] • 1 points • 20 April, 2016 10:36 AM

**[permanently deleted]**

MattyAnon • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 11:26 PM

garnish the father's paycheck and give a chunk of money to the mother to help with the childcare expenses.

If it was there to help with the child, it would be audited as such. The man has to pay, but the mother is free to spend it on herself. Therefore it is *mother support* not child support.

The only reason the "good ol' days" of good wives and sexually conservative behavior existed is because women were forced to behave themselves. They didn't want to

Agreed... except shaming does work. I don't know for sure... but I suspect a lot of the values of the day were internalised. A desire to not be a slut, to be a good wife.... because that was socially rewarded. And women will do almost anything for social rewards.

It's time to start honoring women's real nature. Real women are slutty, shallow, fun-loving lunatics with shitty judgment. And they don't want men to save them from that any more.

Hahaha epic, and so true :)

Great post, thankyou... gonna read it twice more before bed.

TheCanadianEconomist • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 12:36 AM [recovered]

I agree with everything but this part: If you are unattractive, you aren't going to start attracting females by being cocky on purpose, or because you picked up some new hobbies that they don't care about anyways. There's simply a lot more than that to being attractive to females.

LasherDeviance • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 02:38 AM

Generally speaking, women don't care about looks to an extent, as long as you have the money and "swag" to offset it.

redarkane • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 02:05 AM

it's like you guys live only to appease females. just do you. their love is fickle anyways.

TarsierBoy • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 03:09 AM

got it...don't be the bank account they need...but the bank account they want!

Wilreadit • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 04:47 AM

Not the dick they deserve but the dick they crave.

Vasallo7G • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 06:53 PM

I think women are submissive by nature, but just like dogs (bitches?) in the absence of authority a dog will "misbehave" because the dog would believe he is on charge, that is actually what happens with misbehaving dogs their owners are so BP that the dog stresses to be the leader

Moldy\_Gecko • 2 points • 21 April, 2016 04:38 AM

I'm conflicted on this. If women don't need men, then how does the AF/BB strategy still come into play? Would it just be AF/AF? Is the BB to provide for the kids? Why would they need that? They can just get knocked up and be a single mom. How does the AF/BB sexual strategy fit into your theory?

Most the women I've fucked with or know personally want to eventually get married (whether it's just an old notion that's still stuck with them or not). While I know this is true, I just got a reality kick in the face the other night. I went on a date the other night with a chick I previously banged just by going to the arcade and then 2 bars. We hadn't gone on a date for about 2 months after that because she "didn't want to just play". So, on this second date, I decided to go beta mode. I picked her up, set up a tent on the beach, brought cheap ass wine and my cell phone to watch my "hook up" movie. Escalated to fingering and tried to pull down her pants, she said no. Took two steps back and tried to repeat. Still no. We ended up just taking off and she texted me about "just being friends". She said this (don't necessarily trust words) because she knows I don't want marriage and she couldn't see being married to me (although she had previously agreed to not wanting marriage).

This girl is the epitome of AWALT. When I was Chad mode, fucked her in a few hours. When I went Beta, romantic mode, I got dropped. She previously agreed with my stance on marriage because she wanted the Chad D. After Beta date, she reneged on her stance as an excuse to get away from me. I forget if this is Briffault's Law, but it's one of the tenants where they will agree with you regardless if it's what they really want. As long as

I provided the Alpha in her life, she was down for whatever I wanted. Get rid of the "Alpha" and she no longer wants what I want.

There are many other girls I've met recently that are "Forever Single", but they are all young. I've found as the wall approaches, they change their view. So, your theory conflicts with the AF/BB theory. Could you elaborate how these two can exist in the same world?

LasherDeviance • 4 points • 20 April, 2016 02:44 AM

Let's be honest. According to their drives; What women want is an in-shape man, with wealth, with a big dick. But they will sacrifice one of the three for in-shape and big dick, or sacrifice two for wealth, depending upon how wealthy the man is.

Simple as that really.

cantFindValidNam • 4 points • 19 April, 2016 08:14 PM\*

Side question: What is wrong with women pursuing sex for fun? Why is it ok for us men to pursue marriageless sex but women who do the same are looked down to and called sluts? I don't know why but I'm having a hard time accepting the idea of marrying a non virgin, but I haven't found a convincing answer to this question. Why am I wanting a potential wife to have refrained from something I didn't? What's different?

Archwinger[S] • 24 points • 19 April, 2016 08:28 PM

There's nothing "wrong" with women being casual sex sluts. It just makes them bad long-term marital partners, bad future wives, and so on. Undisciplined women with shitty judgment and poor impulse control who don't value sex and essentially treat it as purely unimportant recreation rather than something intimate shared between lovers make shitty wives. Overall, it's bad for society, but lots of fun for the women in question, and for the men fucking them.

A smart woman will restrain her nature and marry a high quality man who values a sexually conservative partner who's cultivated good wife traits. A less smart woman will slut around until she's old enough that hot men don't go home with her as readily, then marry a loser she's not happy with and have a mostly-unhappy marriage for the rest of her life or until she decides to cash out by divorcing him.

[deleted] • 11 points • 19 April, 2016 09:07 PM

Why is it ok for us men to pursue marriageless sex but women who do the same are looked down to and called sluts?

I wouldn't say it's "OK" for men to pursue marriageless sex while women are sluts when they do it. What I would say is that promiscuity doesn't seem to injure men the same way it injures, devalues, and scars women.

The worst thing promiscuity seems to do to men is that it jades them, and makes them bored with sex. Most promiscuous men report episodes of "player burnout" where they get kind of bored with a lifestyle of fucking one woman after another. It's the same thing over and over again. For top players, fucking slut after slut becomes easy and rote. The women in the player's life are interchangeable. They are not interesting or engaging. He becomes disillusioned with the idea of commitment and finding one woman to share his life with, even as he wants this. He wants something more.

By contrast, a slut lifestyle really fucks up most of the women who engage in it. (This isn't revenge fantasy shit. This isn't eeeevil PemBayliss wishing injury and destruction on women; nor is it schadenfreude at the ills of women's poor behavior. It's borne out by observation again and again, and by a bit of science.)

A woman bonds hard to a man she fucks. Nearly all women who engaged in some promiscuous behavior

have had one or two men in their pasts who were really, really attractive, and she bonded pretty hard to them, and she can't get over them. Or she compares all her subsequent men to those one or two prior men, and none measure up (heh).

She cannot lock down a man she's really attracted to. The men she could marry, she's not attracted to. She ends up married to a loser schlub who kowtows to her and tries to make her happy, and this just causes anger, resentment, and disattraction. It's terrible for these women, it really is.

Demonspawn • 8 points • 19 April, 2016 08:54 PM

I'll reply with a repost of mine which is very much in line with the OP, which will hopefully get you to understand how freeing women from their duty to society ends up destroy society: because we need men to be men and women to be women in order for civilization to exist.

---

Women have always been attracted to the leader, the alpha, and even the rogue bad guy. Always.

It's just that before women's suffrage changed our government to the point where women could get men's resources from men without having to keep the man's commitment by pleasing him, these men were big risks for the woman to pursue. Sure, the alpha guy would fuck her, but would he stick around to support her children? As such, the woman's rational brains would temper these drives and impulses such that only women with poor impulse control would actively pursue these men.

The rules have changed now, and the boundary case is the majority of women (boundary case: those who change behavior due to change of rules). Now the majority of women are seeking these previously alpha men (because even if they don't please him enough to secure his commitment, government will secure his resources for her). Only women who think they have no chance of attracting an alpha man or those with extremely high levels of impulse control are those who go after the provider men.

So the women of our society stop rewarding men who protect and provide and instead reward men who are not contributing to society, who are less stable, and who are more rebel like (anti-establishment). Men, of course, react by becoming those types of men to be rewarded. Social stability takes a nosedive and, well, welcome to the death-throes of western civilization. Enjoy the decline; Prepare for the bottom.

TheDonald2k16 • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 09:51 PM

Because the most valuable thing a man can give away is his commitment, while the most valuable thing a woman can give away is sex.

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 April, 2016 08:28 PM

Men are not women and vice versa. Having Sex with lots of men is soul destroying for women (implying their not soulless demons), whereas having sex with lots of women is what men exist for and are empowered by. Men exist to spread their seed.

I personally don't care that women are sluts because I'll never LTR, I just wish they all would admit it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 09:33 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 6 points • 19 April, 2016 09:37 PM

It destroys their ability to maintain a pairbond. I personally don't care because I wouldn't ever want a bitch attached to me, but it destroys their ability to truly attach to an alpha provider. They like the thrill and gene pool mixing of the CC but it destroys them for monogamous relationships. Which we

aren't a monogamous species, but that's the norm.

TheYambag • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 08:48 PM

This is the bluest pill post I've seen on the front page in a long time. The author spits out talk like a textbook former feminist who still buys into the feminist rewritten narrative of what life used to be like, which has no basis in the reality of "old timey" life.

Back in the "good ol' days", a lot of women weren't happy.

I've actually read that this isn't true. In fact a quick google search provides a cornucopia of results directly challenging this idea. "Women are less happy today than they were 40 years ago."

Privileges are awesome, but the responsibilities that come with them often suck. Think about how fondly most people remember their youth. Lots of time for leisure, socially bountiful, working on projects that interested you. Now you work 40+ hours come home have to cook, work out, take care of kids if you have them, and if you're not tough, it's easy to get beat from all of this, as a lot of men are.

Why do you think we're seeing so many people vote for socialism these days? They don't want responsibility, they want to hand responsibilities off to someone else.

Women did not become good wives because they wanted to, or because it's where they gravitate toward due to feminine nature, or because it made them happy. They became good wives because society practically forced them to do so.

This is 100% blue pill thinking. Until the advent of social security it made 100% sense for strong marriages and nuclear families. "Society" didn't force women into subservient roles, "Life" forced both men and women into gender roles. Prior to Social Security only the top 1-5% depending on your area could ever afford to retire unless they had children. Children were retirement plans, and historically until the 1900's children would stay very close to their families and take care of parents in their old age. If you were a man, you needed a strong family unit to make sure that you had some caretakers in your old age. If you were a woman, you needed men to work the fields/mines/factory, which were all very laborious and often dangerous jobs. Would you rather dig all day in the field, or go for a walk to retrieve water to put in your wagon, then walk it back to the house, wash clothes, take care of kids and livestock, then prepare food? Womens roles were less physically dangerous and demanding, they were absolutely winning in these deals and so were men.

Women who have less sexual partners still rate their lives as happier. The reality is that lots of sexual partners is bad for individuals and bad for society. Sexually promiscuous societies fall to sexually conservative societies. You can downvote this, hate it, whatever, but the truth is there is a reason why modern Islam is able to permeate and conquer other cultures, and not vice-versa. It has everything to do with harsh sexual conservatism.

One last thing. I'm not telling any of you what to do, but I am telling you the historical and modern reality of our current global cultural landscape. What does it really say about your value if you can get a girl to sleep with you, but you can't get a girl to stay with you? "*Blah blah blah, but I don't want a girl to stay with me, I want to spin plates*", okay fine, but then you also bitch about "the good ol' days", so what do you fucking want you indecisive fucks? Do you want the good ol' days, where sexual conservatism and culture were strong, or do you want our divisive nanny state culture that uses your tax dollars to help other cultures take root into yours? They're mutually exclusive, no matter how angry that makes you, you can only pick one.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 April, 2016 09:45 PM\*

It did come across as feminist-influenced. The Great Lie of feminism is that women were 'oppressed' by having an extended family around them, raising children, rather than working out in the mines or the fields

or going out to the battlefields. As you say, female happiness has been declining since the 1970s, the beginning of 2nd wave, and is now lower than men's. Also, women are on much higher rates of anti-depressants. Women have been sold a crock.

However, that does not mean that AF/BB was not still present in previous centuries, and women would definitely cheat if the opportunity presented itself. They were indeed 'good', 'loyal' wives because society put that constraint upon them. They stayed in marriages rather than chasing the latest cock to take their fancy because otherwise they would be social outcasts and begging on the streets. But women don't know what makes them happy, and that is part of their dilemma.

A final point: women are not independent of men, financially or otherwise. They are totally dependent on men, but they are blind to it. The sort of jobs that women take, the nice, safe, comfortable, office jobs, exist only because men invented the industrial and information revolutions, and continue to exist because of the basic infrastructure (transport, road and rail networks, heavy manufacturing, energy and fuel supplies, water and sewage, agriculture, etc) that men still do and women play hardly any part in. It is just that the men who do these essential tasks are invisible to women. Take away the men, and society, and the financial 'independence' disappears overnight. Take away the pharmaceutical companies and the pill they produce, and the women are all pregnant in a short time and no longer able to go out to work. And so many are dependent on government grants and 'diversity' initiatives to make them 'equal'. Even with all that, most are still miserable without a man in their lives. So not independent of men, just independent of any individual man.

What we have now is much more like the situation in pre-agricultural, tribal times. I'm not convinced that prehistoric men paired off monogamously and looked after 'their' children, the children were children of the village. They wouldn't even know the connection between who fucked them 9 months previously and what popped out today. So I think we were promiscuous by nature, although less promiscuous than chimpanzees (fits with data on testicle size in primates, we are larger than gorillas and orang-utans, not as big as chimpanzees, which likely says something about sperm competition and hence promiscuity).

tallwheel • 2 points • 20 April, 2016 01:36 AM

I can see how someone familiar with the feminist narrative we have today would see the connection, but it is not actually a feminist-original idea that Archwinger is talking about here. TRP has always acknowledged that religion and traditionalism had rules in order to keep women in line, and to provide as many betas with wives as possible. This was advantageous as it gave children stable upbringings and created a working society.

So, in a way, Archwinger and feminists are both talking about the same thing. The difference is that feminists frame it as "oppression", and identify the motivation as men hating women, and creating a world run by men for the benefit of men. Whereas we identify the motivation as creating a productive society.

Whether women were happier in the old system I think is a complicated question that can only be answered with "yes and no". Sure, women with an unattractive husband especially felt the tingles for the alphas around her, and it must have sucked knowing that she would never be allowed to act on those tingles. On the other hand, having a lack of choice actually has been shown to make humans more happy in many cases. See "The Paradox of Choice" by Barry Schwartz. If she knows that 'this is her family'. 'This is all there is for her,' then she will make the most of the situation she's been given.

And why not? This is the same situation that betas had to live with in traditionalist society as well. His wife was usually not all that hot, and he would lust after the hotter women he would see around him, and being a Beta meant that there was little possibility of banging that hottie on the side. But he made the most of the wife and family that he had. In the long run, I'm sure most senior men and women looked

back and were glad that they raised the family that they did, despite that they both had to sacrifice short-term pleasure in order to get where they ended up.

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 April, 2016 09:33 PM

"Women are less happy today than they were 40 years ago."

Women weren't happy being married to unattractive men.

Women were really unhappy with having to submit to unattractive men, live with unattractive men, and fuck unattractive men.

Women aren't faithful, good wives, or kind because it's in their nature to be such. They act as such because they get constrained into it.

TheYambag • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 02:52 AM

Your narrative is wrong. The data says that women are LESS happy now compared to 40 years ago. You can get as butthurt as you want about this data, but your feelings aren't going to change the numbers.

Google for ten seconds and you'll find loads more data and publications on the topic. Here is another source that claims that all adults are less happy today than they used to be.

BlackJ1 • 1 point • 19 April, 2016 08:38 PM

This is saddening really, however I am always plagued with the same question....

Is their an end game? A perfect solution/world in which both man and woman be happy?

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 April, 2016 09:07 PM

No. Our sexual strategies go directly against each other. The optimal situation is your woman is your queen and you are king, the most powerful man in the world, and you still fuck chicks on the side. None of these except fucking chicks on the side is realistic.

wave650 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:45 AM

I'm going to have to print this out and read it every morning until it penetrates my thick skull.

ransay3277 • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 01:46 AM

Great post. The best part is that you summed up the whole thing in the title.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 12:51 PM

I like it. a completely dispassionate telling of the current sexual marketplace.

These are the current rules, you can either mope about it, or learn to play... not both

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:06 PM

I enjoyed this. I really resonated with your main point. Women have fought hard to be independent. They were fed up with the old. They wanted to live in the new. Well that's exactly what society has brought them. Feminism.

The curtain has been lifted. Marriage has essentially been evaporated. Fact: divorce rate is an all time high at

50%. That 1 in 2 marriages as a national average folks. That's quite the gamble where, as a male, you are in your best interest to avoid because you will lose. Every fucking time.

Fuck hoes and fuck them good. Start giving a shit about yourself. Give two shits less when it involves a woman.

benuntu • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:45 PM

What you're saying is that men and women are very similar, and I agree. We both want to have fun, fuck who turns us on physically, and tend to make bad decisions in the heat of the moment. And men and women alike, it's always more fun to hang out with people who like to have fun (obvious?).

So for men and women, the best strategy to attract the opposite sex is to work out, don't pig out, do fun things, and don't try to be someone you're not. Be honest about your attraction, invite them to do the things you have fun doing, and stop worrying about being their provider/supporter.

I guess "bad" is something of a subjective moral term. A better description might be that feminine nature is very self-interested, pleasure-seeking, live-for-today behavior.

...

Real women are slutty, shallow, fun-loving lunatics with shitty judgment. And they don't want men to save them from that any more.

EntitledShitHead • 1 point • 21 April, 2016 04:20 AM

When I first started TRP, I started working on myself, and trying to become a better conversationalist and better at 'listening' to the other person, but as I quickly found out, women hate that. You really just have to be bold, and literally lead the conversation and just work on having fun. If you try to build an emotional connection she'll view that as rape.

FueledUp • 1 point • 20 May, 2016 05:26 AM

i don't give a shit what women need, I care what society as a whole needs.

rakov • 1 point • 19 April, 2016 09:53 PM

Start being muscular, cocky, fun, and socially apt.

But what if I don't want to be all that. Even idea feels disgusting for me. Imagining myself being social and confident is like imagining myself putting a hand into bucket of worms. Should I spend all my life pretending to be Chad, put all this effort into just having a fuck? I don't think so.

tompanz • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 07:31 AM

You need to develop your social skills. They are far more important than getting your puss. Not only does it open up a huge amount of opportunities, it also makes every day interactions funner, and nerve wracking ones bearable.

rakov • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 10:11 AM

it also makes every day interactions funner

I don't have everyday interactions, I only talk with humans online, on Reddit and such. Barely even this.

You need to develop your social skills.

I keep hearing about these "social skills". What exactly they are? So, there is image you maintain, created from bunch of things like having nice clothes, talking with clear and weighted tone, having money, etc - and there is ground for interaction - topics to talk about, things to do together, etc. These two I understand well, but what this "social skills" is? Or is it just a supercategory that includes these two? In

this case fuck it. I'm too lazy to maintain image and get on grounds.

tompanz • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 11:53 AM

The ability to maintain a conversation with strangers and acquaintances and the knowledge of social cues basically. Before I joined the military I had no idea how woefully underdeveloped those skills were for me.

rakov • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 12:13 PM\*

The ability to maintain a conversation

What's the point of the pointless conversation though?

the knowledge of social cues

That's plain disgusting. If they don't want to say everything in plain text, it's only their fault and I'm not going to bend and learn their lies.

People are disgusting. They are shallow, faulty, hypocritical. It won't be right if I adapt; it will mean they won. But it will be right if I gather power (by other means than social) and force them to obey me.

juliusstreicher • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 09:03 AM

Well, what if I don't want to be a talented producer who gives value to people who pay money for it? There's an answer for that, too. I get what I earn, I suppose...

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 April, 2016 10:57 PM

Then be a pussyless loser who's "true to himself"

tallwheel • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 02:04 AM

Hrm... well... the more polite term is MGTOW I suppose.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 03:25 AM

HAHAHA. kinda relevant. I'm going to be a mgtow, but not the hermit type. I'm gonna be the gorgeous bachelor that never gets married and fucks all the college girls type mgtow.

BuddhistSC • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 07:30 AM

Meta: Why is every post on this subreddit extremely longwinded and inconcise? I think I haven't seen a single post that wasn't literally 4 times as long as it needed to be to convey its information.

joseph\_fuzzco\_Jr • 1 point • 19 April, 2016 06:55 PM

We're living in different times. Adapt or die.

Glocks10mike • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 12:22 AM

I see this stuff all the time on this website about how money doesn't matter anymore because women aren't looking for providers, but I would argue that life is still much, much better when you have money.

[deleted] • 8 points • 20 April, 2016 12:35 AM

You can be rich and still not be a provider. Just don't give any bitches your money. That simple.

Theophagist • 1 point • 20 April, 2016 08:07 AM

women who want to become self-sufficient can do so

There are far too many gainfully employed and prominent women in history for me to fully believe this was ever really not the case. I don't buy the Father Knows Best/Leave it to Beaver image of the 50's in the same way I don't buy the popular version of the English Renaissance.

redolas • -1 points • 19 April, 2016 08:57 PM

Real women are slutty, shallow, fun-loving lunatics with shitty judgment.

Humans are promiscuous. As men, so are women. Men are slutty too. We should all embrace that, now that we can control the outcome.

That means competition is back in the game. No marriage means we have to go back to the roots. A man can not get guaranteed pussy in his life just by having a job and getting a wife. All you have now is attraction. We can't use force, because that's not how it works. I think we all agree, force and violence is and should stay tamed. The only one issue with the world is that women hide what is attractive to them. But hiding was their only weapon for millions of years.

Love yourself first and then love your women. But love them now, not forever.

[deleted] • -1 points • 19 April, 2016 09:09 PM

False. Never love the woman.

redolas • 0 points • 20 April, 2016 12:14 AM

Oh, ok. Good luck loving your fellow men then.

[deleted] • -1 points • 20 April, 2016 12:19 AM

Caring about men has nothing to do with women. I love my bros, I hate/don't care about bitches besides sex.

redolas • 0 points • 20 April, 2016 12:29 AM

So caring is love, and sex is hate?

BuymyGookiGooki • -1 points • 20 April, 2016 07:12 AM **[recovered]**

I definitely agree with many points about how women don't need a man to survive anymore however I do think it's highly biased to say it's in all women's nature to be slutty. Everyone has morals some less than others. It's wrong to completely categorize women into one entity just as it's wrong to categorize men.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 April, 2016 01:43 PM

No they don't. Women do not have morals. They are all sluts who chase power and tingles.