

How many laws/rules did the government, church, and society need to keep hypergamy and women's crazy at bay? Hundreds, thousands?

June 29, 2019 | 8 upvotes | by [boy_named_su](#)

Think how powerful hypergamy is that these powerful institutions needed so many draconian rules to control it

Archived from [theredarchive.com](https://www.theredarchive.com)

Comments

[deleted] 29 June, 2019 07:06 AM*

[deleted]

DWShimoda • 1 point • 29 June, 2019 04:53 PM

If men had just accepted it to begin with and understood it as they do other aspects of nature we'd be fine.

Some societies men DID do so...

And those societies (if you can even call *realistically* them that) are basically still living in "mud huts" and existing at only a subsistence level.

Ergo if you WANT to "just accept that" -- along with other "aspects of nature" -- well, good luck with the hunting & foraging... 'cause that's BACK where you will end up (and probably in much quicker fashion than you imagine; because modern 'civilization' is actually much more 'fragile' than you think).

DangZagnut • 6 points • 29 June, 2019 07:23 AM

There's nothing wrong with hypergamy, *its how the system evolved*.

The right thing to do is eliminate any religious or cultural nonsense that allows someone to profit from it, ie marriage, divorce alimony, child support, etc. that's what needs to go.

If someone wants to have relationships upwards, great, but take away all safety nets and payoffs for doing so.

RealBiggly • 2 points • 29 June, 2019 08:28 AM*

It only took one.

If she leaves, she has to leave the kids with their rightful guardian, their father.

Men love women. Women love kids. It worked.

Then some brain-dead morons, overcome with chivalry and being incels, figured it was natural to give the kids to the women.

Yes of course it's natural. The entire point and basis of civilization is that it's not natural.

Do you want this (note the man lets the woman do the digging, because why should he?):

<https://images.app.goo.gl/2A25qqMjuC2suy3Y8>

or this: <https://images.app.goo.gl/7D5BsWHND6nT3nZ88>

As a side note, just try asking Jewgle to find you a positive picture of modern civilization? Go ahead and try...

See if you can figure out the message we're being sent?

Edit: To back up what I keep saying about how in nature there's no fatherhood, that photo is of these people:

"The Hadza are organized into bands, called 'camps' in the literature, of typically 20–30 people, though camps of over a hundred may form during berry season. There is no tribal or other governing hierarchy, and almost all decisions are made by reaching an agreement through discussion. Furthermore, the Hadza are egalitarian, meaning there are no real status differences between individuals. While males and the elderly receive slightly

more respect, within groups of age and sex all individuals are equal, and compared to strictly stratified societies, women are considered fairly equal. This egalitarianism results in high levels of freedom and self-dependency.[30] When conflict does arise, it may be resolved by one of the parties voluntarily moving to another camp. Ernst Fehr and Urs Fischbacher point out that the Hadza people "exhibit a considerable amount of altruistic punishment" to organize these tribes.[31] The Hadza live in a communal setting and engage in cooperative child rearing, where many individuals (both related and unrelated) provide high quality care for children."

In other words, no fatherhood, no patriarchy, and they literally dig in the dirt for worms.

You want civilization, you need fatherhood. We destroyed fatherhood in the West. Look around you, are things improving, or falling apart?

DWShimoda • 3 points • 29 June, 2019 04:41 PM*

It only took one.

If she leaves, she has to leave the kids with their rightful guardian, their father.

THIS^.

Women basically didn't have "legal standing" as adults; a married woman could *leave* her husband/family (albeit NOT legally "divorce" him) but essentially if she did so, she was "abandoning" her husband, family & home, and left not only without any means to obtain "cash & prizes", but with *nothing* or at least nothing more than the "clothes on her back" (and possibly some other minor/trivial "personal" effects/belongings); for a woman to "take the children" without the father's permission was literally "kidnapping" and for her to take what didn't *personally* belong to her (personal effects) was rightly considered theft.

THE single BIGGEST MISTAKE did not happen with "giving women the vote"... but rather happened long prior to that (circa mid 19th century), via what is/was called the "Tender Years Doctrine" which entirely FLIPPED (inverted) the whole point of legal marriage by granting women default PRIMARY custody of (young) children -- essentially turning them into "property/slaves" of women -- and thus began the whole "weaponizing" of children by women *against* fathers (and *against* society at large).

RealBiggly • 2 points • 29 June, 2019 05:14 PM

Awesome to find someone else who understands and knows about this stuff :)

I have an overly long screed I regularly paste on here, detailing this stuff.

DWShimoda • 2 points • 29 June, 2019 06:43 PM

Its why... although undoubtedly society would have to "roll back" things like the welfare state, no fault divorce, women voting, etc... all of that would be for naught... **unless & until the REAL core/crux of the matter were reversed:** and that is to go back to "DEFAULT husband/father FULL custody of children."

AeternusDoleo • 1 point • 29 June, 2019 01:07 PM

Only two. The threat of social stigma (shaming tactics work extremely well on women), and the threat of destitution. In proto-societies it was probably the threat of violence.

NAILmg42 • 1 point • 29 June, 2019 05:45 PM

No not one rule counted in law. THERE WERE NO LAWS FOR WOMEN. Why? Because religion and culture were the morality of their day and risking female liberation was no gamble society was ready to try.

Developing culture that promotes male authority will change that nations attitude and behaviours and that will then start its onslaught manifestation in law at a later point, and women may view it as something that enslaves them in that time. Morality only ever repeats itself, it never resolves itself.