

#1 Trending Video on YouTube today is titled "Alpha Males Do Not Exist"

August 3, 2017 | 1233 upvotes | by [mallardcove](#)

Not going to link that garbage but the #1 trending video on YouTube today is this video of a John Oliver look alike skinny fat hipster glasses wearing loser preaching to us about why there is no such thing as an alpha male.

As someone who works in the media myself I can attest first hand that the media and establishment structures doing all they can to attack real men is not by accident. It is by design. The goal is to weaken men and make them effeminate losers who are easy to walk over. Strong, masculine men are the #1 enemy to the global establishment.

Here is the deal. Most men will see this video, and articles like "Why women prefer dad bods" and "Real men date single moms" and other filth aimed at weakening strong men and actually believe its the case. These videos, while pathetic, are actually a good thing as most men will run with them as fact and do just that. They will stop lifting and get that dad bod. They will stop trying to act masculine and be threatened by their masculinity. They will try to rope in that catch of a single mom. Why, because the media told them to. Media = brainwashing. It's a good thing because it thins the herd. It makes getting into that Top 20% or Top 10% or Top 5% of men that much easier. To the point where simply lifting, eating right, staying in shape, dressing well, having good posture and not having an awkward demeanor will put you into the Top 20% by default.

These videos are good for the individual male who is looking to climb the ladder in the male hierarchy. Unfortunately its bad for men and society as a whole. The weaker men get, the easier it will be for oppressive establishment operatives to trample our rights and walk all over us with more tyranny and freedom/liberty stripping actions.

Archived from [theredarchive.com](#)

Comments

[deleted] • 251 points • 3 August, 2017 07:09 PM

To be fair, the bit on David Mech is true. Originally he invented the idea of wolves following a hierarchy with an alpha wolf on top. But subsequent research found that the hierarchy is based on familial relations (if 'familial relations' is appropriately used in a wolf context) rather than dominance.

But this is not to say that the idea of alpha and dominance did not exist before David Mech. This idea predates Mech's research on wolves by millennia. The logical fallacy made here is that the idea of a dominant alpha human male was born out of Mech's research, which is completely fucking stupid.

[deleted] • 79 points • 4 August, 2017 01:06 AM

Yeah....I had to watch it too.

Massive straw man. Alpha/Beta doesn't depend on Mech's work.

Also, according to Frans de Wall (sp?), alpha chimps don't always win....because if they are too dictatorial, they get taken down by the #2 & #3 chimps cooperating.

Which, again, hardly matters.

So many layers of subtly our detractors do not get. Jocko Willinck, a dude so Alpha he has Jock in his name, teaches to lead "up and down the command chain". Etc. On & on.

grandaddychimp • 57 points • 4 August, 2017 02:16 AM*

Yep, "alpha" is just a word that describes exhibition of genetics and behaviors that women find sexually attractive and get their dopamine flowing. "Beta" is exhibition of genetics and behaviors that women find preferable for long term relationships and are good for bonding/oxytocin, like being a provider of resources/emotional validation/attention, etc.

Even TRP sidebar introduction says that no man should strive to be 100% alpha, but a healthy mixture of alpha and beta.

2comment • 8 points • 4 August, 2017 03:55 AM

David Mech's book popularized it, but didn't invent it.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alpha_\(ethology\)#Canines](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alpha_(ethology)#Canines)

max_peenor • 10 points • 4 August, 2017 03:55 PM

It was shit science all around and he was actually wrong the second time too. Ultimately, the deal was not that wolves have pack alphas or not, but the circumstances that cause it. Sometimes they do. Sometimes they do not. Stress situations cause pack changes, which is pretty much the same for ALL pack animals. Watching a single pack in a single place and drawing any conclusions was retarded.

rathyAro • 4 points • 4 August, 2017 11:29 AM

What about the point that our close relatives don't follow the alpha/beta structure either?

[deleted] • 12 points • 4 August, 2017 03:26 PM

The bonobos? I am not well versed on the topic of bonobos to be taken seriously so take my comment with a grain of salt, it's pure conjecture.

But it's yet another bad argument. The fact that bonobos are matriarchal does not mean they do not follow the alpha / beta structure. At the core, the idea about the alpha and beta are that there are individuals (alphas) who have certain traits that make them more successful sexually and socially than others (betas). Any person who would disagree with this idea is a complete fucking moron in my opinion. You can have a matriarchal society with alpha and beta females. The only thing that changes between a matriarchy and patriarchy is who has the power and who is more dominant.

Frankly, the stereotype the video attacked is one of a pompous douchebag that tries way too hard, not an alpha. I can get behind that cause, somewhat. It's quite easy to spot losers that take alpha traits and embody them to ridiculous extremes. They become aggressive rather than assertive, cocky rather than confident, trying way too hard to get girls and so on.

chief-w • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 06:49 AM

I idea that family relations, not pure shows off strength, determine your position in society (human or wolf) can be traveling back to Plato's Republic. But a delving into that black hole will land you in the world of the Neo-Reactionaries (nrx for short) and the Dark Enlightenment stuff.

It's interesting, but only if you can make a lot of defeatest murmuring about how better it will be after the next near extinction level event.

sup1337hax • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 08:02 AM

He also only mentioned that being kind and caring are good for long term relationships, while saying nothing about short term relationships.

Darth_Antonius • 56 points • 3 August, 2017 07:05 PM

There's also the part where they show matriarchy as more dominant than a patriarchy. Lol, name me a human matriarchal society that isn't a primitive shithole.

WhorehouseVet • 50 points • 3 August, 2017 07:29 PM

I can't even name one matriarchy society.

Darth_Antonius • 19 points • 3 August, 2017 07:42 PM

Exactly, the only ones that exist are small, tribal communities in extremely isolated locations. They're that forgettable.

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 01:37 AM

That is because they were fucking decimated by patriarchal tribes. Their pathetic genes erased from the collective.

CoronaTRP • 3 points • 22 August, 2017 01:56 AM

Matriarchal genes are not pathetic, they are just not right for our environment. Just look at chimps.

I think this has to do with availability of resources: If resources are scarce, it becomes more important to have strong competition between the males and in a patriarchy, the stakes are higher.

But if resources are plentiful, a female doesn't need a strong male who can defend resources and be territorial, because she gets to eat anyway.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 August, 2017 03:20 AM

Nature provides very few ecosystems where resources are plentiful and where competition is

unnecessary.

What about males competing to spread their genes? Don't they fight to establish dominance and from there the females will select the dominant males for breeding?

This fighting is how animals propagate better genes. If competition is removed and the females just lie on their backs during ovulation and allow any beta chimp to fill them up, their gene pool would be destroyed in a few short generations.

CoronaTRP • 2 points • 22 August, 2017 01:26 PM

I think it the difference is similar to wealthy and poor areas in human society. In very poor areas, men have a tendency to become violent and get away with everything, especially since some women are highly dependent on the men.

In rich areas, women are more independent. They can form strong bonds and can collectively dominate lone males and keep them in check if they misbehave. Sure, the same principles still apply, the men still compete for the women, they just use other more subtle strategies to show value. They can't go around and beat every man and women into submission and secure sex that way, because the congregating women will shut him down, with help of the males who want to gain status with them. It just is more efficient for men to compete in more abstract ways, like mastery, money or social status.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 August, 2017 11:34 PM

In rich areas, women are more independent.

This is only because the western culture and government has secured this for women. Without men yielding their power, women would not have received the right to vote etc.

They can form strong bonds and can collectively dominate lone males and keep them in check if they misbehave.

It is only due to cultural conditioning that these men apply beta game and yield to women. This is their *game*. It is their strategy to attain pussy because they lack enough SMV to compete with real men. Their yielding has nothing to do with female superiority and everything to do with attaining the warm hole between their legs. They are utilize covert contracts, essentially exchanging their attention and resources with the expectation to receive sex.

They can't go around and beat every man and women into submission and secure sex that way

This is a fundamental natural law, however. It is very important to realize this is where our evolutionary roots began. To understand human kind now, this is where we should look. Millions of years of evolution greatly out influences a few decades of paradigm shifting and cultural Marxism.

because the congregating women will shut him down, with help of the males who want to gain status with them.

Tying this to my point earlier about beta men using covert contracts with the expectation of sex from women. These men are not helping these women because "its the right thing to do," despite what the average white knight would insist. They are attempting to "gain status" in order to receive sex. The very act of attempting to exchange resources or

protection for sex runs contrary to female sexuality, however. Although, women certainly make use of this facilitation from beta men. Females ultimately choose to mate with males who display superior genes, both aesthetically and performance/behavior based. This is what beta males fundamentally do not understand. In their attempt to exchange resources for sex, they are indirectly telling the female to they do not possess genetic superiority and must 'buy' their sex through provisions.

The points you brought up tell me two things. The first, you hold bluepill fantasies as truth and secondly, have not read any of the sidebar material. You're explaining the SMP to me as if you've just finished a buffet of Disney movies followed by a stint moderating over at twoX. Please read the sidebar in depth before trying to convince anyone that your perspectives have any validity. If you want to actually have a debate, you've gotta get learned first.

CoronaTRP • 2 points • 23 August, 2017 09:41 PM

Funny thing is that I agreed with everything you said here, you pretty much said it very nicely. Except that I haven't read the sidebar, I think I worded my reply badly or we have another kind of misunderstanding here.

I agree with RP theory, my only point was that in a resourceful environment, violence makes less sense if you want to pass on your genes. These men are not purer by any means, put them in a more harsher environment and they will become thugs or get eaten.

[deleted] • 4 points • 23 August, 2017 11:23 PM

You have or haven't read the sidebar material?

The thing is, when you point out blue pill examples you're pointing out situations or human behaviour that are occurring because of our culture. Without our culture facilitating them, they wouldn't occur because male and female evolutionary upbringing isn't suited for it.

A young woman getting drunk, slapping men in the face and running her mouth while white knights step in to defend her from guys shes assaulted - type situation - would not occur without heavy cultural manipulation (which has occurred over the past 60 years).

violence makes less sense if you want to pass on your genes. These men are not purer by any means, put them in a more harsher environment and they will become thugs or get eaten.

I've gotta say it again, this is blue pill fantasy. * The way of Men* by Jack Donovan does an excellent job of outlining what it means to be a man. Essentially, men have evolved for a very simple purpose - survive and reproduce. To do that they must work together with other men in their tribe, set a perimeter, hunt and protect their females and children. Every tribe needs a leader(s) which is where alpha and beta arose. What ranks men on where they sit in that spectrum is the 4 values of men: strength, courage, trust and game. Game being ones inclination to fight, not 'game' in trp classical sense.

Violence is so deep rooted in the human genome because it is the arena in which our survival was carved. This is why it is a redpill truth. The pseudo environment

which we've created, corporate america/urban social settings etc. are the synthetic, bluepilled environments, not the African Savannah or Arctic Circle Tundra where strength, courage, trust and game rein supreme.

The reason why red pill tenets such as build muscle, lose fat, gain confidence, build frame and learn game work, is because they are characteristics of men who aligned with the four values of strength, courage, trust/honor and game. They are the same values which make a man successful in his natural environment and because of that are the values which women value as well (or at least have been subconsciously programmed to seek out). Any RP man who has built muscle and gained an intimidating appearance knows that men and women treat him differently. They look to him as their leader. This is no coincidence.

[deleted] • 11 points • 5 August, 2017 01:36 AM

My ex: "Native Americans were matriarchal!"

Me: "Yes, and they got fucking smashed by the white man's superior culture and technical innovation. Regardless of your feelings and opinion, nature don't give no fucks. You take what you want or you get nothing."

Her: "But if we continue down this path there will be nothing left but war and destruction for future generations! We need a matriarchal society to achieve peace and love!"

Me: "No, all that will do is weaken our society/tribe so that we get dominated by another patriarchy you dumb bitch. What we need is controlled outlets for healthy masculinity. This is why we have the hunger games."

Her: "Oooh."

scalyblue • 6 points • 10 August, 2017 11:51 PM

The only part of the White Man's culture that smashed Native Americans was their propensity to live alongside cattle and rats for thousands of years prior to crossing the Atlantic. Native Americans got smashed by smallpox, trichonosis, and leptospirosis, not patriarchy, and not superior technology.

If the Native Americans hadn't been literally decimated by European diseases, they would have had no difficulty kicking the Europeans off the continent.

yizolo • 3 points • 18 August, 2017 02:29 PM

That's where I was going with this. Some estimates put the loss of Native Americans at 98%, meaning instead of dealing with the armies of hundreds of thousands like the Spanish conquistadors in Central America, the notion of "Manifest Destiny" stood against armies of no more than a few thousand *at most*.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2017 03:18 AM

You're delusional. Europeans greatly out gunned the native Americans. Natives didn't even have fire arms for fuck sakes. Disease did play a large role in their submission, but it would have happened without a shred of doubt by military force if disease didn't intervene.

What I will say, regarding the Apache warriors, they're some of the greatest champions to ever walk this earth. But even their warrior spirit and combat skill was no match for rifles and greater numbers.

dissentforall • 2 points • 31 August, 2017 06:49 AM

The Europeans didn't have greater numbers. 90% of them died to malaria or similiar disease within the first two years of arrival. It took generations for considerable immunity to develop. This also applied to the civil war and division along the Mason Dixon line. You can't fight a war when most of your army is "afflicted by agues and consumption".

The Europeans didn't know the land and often only survived because the natives didn't engage them for entire seasons or years while they wallowed In disease ridden colonies.

Do not think that slightly better weaponry will always give the edge. Just look at what happened in Vietnam.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2017 05:28 PM

This just proves my point further. Why did native tribes succumb to the Europeans, then? They certainly attempted on may occasions to wage war and drive our the Europeans, but ultimately failed. I say that failure was due to superior European technology and military ability.

GlutenFreeVegan • 1 point • 10 August, 2017 02:31 PM

Alright I'll bite. China. I've lived there and it's not the patriarchal wife beating/overbearing society that everyone (aka chinese women) claims it is. I can't speak for the government but on a family and business level it's absolutely matriarchal. The men are too exhausted from being overworked and underpaid (overtime 6 days a week is the norm) to be adequate fathers. The mothers thus spoil the shit out of their children who don't receive any discipline and they run around causing a fucking ruckus. On top of that the men have been fed blue pill bullshit their whole lives that they should put women on a pedestal and work hard to support for them. The women here don't put up a front about equal treatment and being better than men. Instead they go the "women are weaker than men so you have to treat us well and support us" route (actual quote from chinese girls). In the workplace, it leads to absolute shit shows where nobody wants to address any problem and everyone is just extremely passive aggressive towards each other. They'll never fire their employees but they'll make their lives so miserable that the worker will volunteer quitting so that the employer can say "oh well he was a terrible worker anyways". Matriarchy is fucking garbage and has no place in the workplace or at homes.

KenMicMarKey • -11 points • 3 August, 2017 10:04 PM

The Queen of England would like a word with you.

[deleted] • 9 points • 4 August, 2017 05:02 AM

A single ruler doesn't make a matriarchy.

Darth_Antonius • 4 points • 4 August, 2017 08:32 PM

A single ruler with little to no actual political power for that matter.

halfback910 • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 12:45 AM*

And even when Victoria and Elizabeth (Armada one) reigned, indeed as some of the most pervasively powerful monarchs the crown has ever seen, Britain was still a patriarchy. Which is not to take away from the competence of Elizabeth and, to a lesser extent, Victoria. Elizabeth was one of like... two or three European Monarchs in that era that was not a complete fucking moron. Even if you discount the ones who had a good excuse via inbreeding.

Victoria was okay, Elizabeth is on par with Frederick of Prussia, Henry of Navarre, and a few other monarchs who won the birth lottery and were quite intelligent in their own right. Elizabethan diplomacy essentially laid the bedrock for British diplomatic strategy vis a vis the European continent for the next two hundred years. More or less "Keep them squabbling among themselves."

TRP_MushaShugyo • 381 points • 3 August, 2017 04:53 PM

What an obnoxious dude. Jordan Peterson would like to have a word with him.

chubbyjezus • 179 points • 3 August, 2017 05:26 PM

He'd probably tell him to sort himself out

PornPartyPizzaPayday • 1 points • 3 August, 2017 05:33 PM [recovered]

ROUGHLY SPEAKING

sigma272 • 73 points • 3 August, 2017 07:06 PM

Uncle Jordan can speak roughly to me anytime *water spray emoji*

BullshittingNonsense • 76 points • 3 August, 2017 08:25 PM

Jordan is like the father of all us fatherless internet dwellers. I imagine he is the best father. Maybe sometimes a little emotionless, but goddamn is he a great role model and gives amazing advice.

talltexan123456 • 38 points • 3 August, 2017 08:49 PM

Jordan has been banned from YouTube according to Joe Rogan's latest podcast with Ben Shapiro...

[deleted] • 24 points • 3 August, 2017 09:15 PM

That means another JRE podcast featuring Jordan incoming!

RoxoViejo • 46 points • 3 August, 2017 09:15 PM

His channels are still up and on one of his channels there was a new video posted 4 hours ago. He was indeed locked out, but that has been solved so far I know.

Klaatu678 • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 09:15 PM

Where in the podcast does this get brought up? Can you post a time?

puthrowitdown • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 09:52 PM

I don't know an exact time as I was listening to the audio on my commute to the job this morning. I'm fairly sure it's within the first 15-20 minutes though.

HobbesTheBrave • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:19 PM

As if we lived and died on our good reputation.

Bing400 • 1 points • 6 August, 2017 03:35 AM [recovered]

Why? Does he even give a shit about this community? What makes him so great? Educate me, he lectures in the town over.

dissentforall • 1 point • 31 August, 2017 06:57 AM

The man is brilliant. He integrates psychology, evolutionary biology and an understanding of human nature (based on both statistics and folk wisdom) into a productive and positive view point in how to orient yourself in the world.

He's a big believer in sorting internal inconsistencies in order to make you a force for positivity and productivity. He's also exceptionally well educated and we'll spoken about the Follies of human nature and their relation of totalitarian systems.

Look up his maps of meaning lectures, that's a good place to start. So are any of his recent pieces regarding him being taken before the Canadian human rights commissions.

Just listen to any of his lectures, they're humble and will likely change the way you view many things

dykedestroyer • 36 points • 3 August, 2017 08:18 PM

well that's a bloody good supposition

TRP_MushaShugyo • 33 points • 3 August, 2017 07:01 PM

He'd tell him to go clean his room.

xXx420VTECxXx • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 10:37 PM

Only people with clean rooms get into heaven.

Casanova-Quinn • 53 points • 3 August, 2017 08:19 PM

Not to mention he straight up lied. Adam falsely states the Bonobos are more closely related to humans than Chimps. The source that he cited actually does not say that.

"The bonobo is a sister species to the more widespread common chimpanzee, Pan troglodytes, and the two share equal footing as our nearest primate kin." —NYT

BullshittingNonsense • 27 points • 3 August, 2017 08:26 PM

Plus, who would wanna live in bonobo society? It seems awful. I'd much rather gangster chimps who patrol their territory and kill for fun. Note: Not being sarcastic whatsoever. I think if chimps wanted to, they could just conquer the bonobos.

TheTonkatank • 21 points • 4 August, 2017 03:27 AM

but chimps are mean and violent. bonobos use sex to solve their problems. doesnt that sound great? they also eat their young but dont tell anybody.

TheRedThrowAwayPill • 30 points • 4 August, 2017 06:31 AM

> Use sex to solve problems.

> Kill their babies

So, basically, like female humans?

lipidsly • 5 points • 4 August, 2017 09:29 AM

Its more like bonobos are feminist society versus chimp patriarchal society

max_peenor • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 03:56 PM

And ultimately the chimps could eliminate the entire bonobo genetic line if they wanted to do it.

Not something they talk about in social justice classes.

lipidsly • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 04:08 PM

TFM has a great video on the subject

BullshittingNonsense • 6 points • 4 August, 2017 03:38 AM

Bonobo society is basically modern society on acid in a few years if we continue on this path

-ATLAS- • 3 points • 4 August, 2017 08:38 AM

Don't forget, even in bonobos society, the battle is for the beta males *as a resource*. The different women literally collect them up. It literally is about who has the most orbiters, it starts with their children, but if I remember correctly (and I could be wrong), when one female socially displaces another in the ladder, she takes the orbiters from the other. I don't think they take each other's children, but there were instances where it occurred. Again, I could be wrong, but I do remember the whole thing being fascinating and thinking it was a playbook for how women in high school ran their social circles except for the two women having sex after they fight to settle things down. Pretty much everybody gets laid but the lower male monkeys.

perplexedm • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 09:08 AM

Bonobos are feminists dream animals for humans to study from (stupid, ironic, in real life monkey imitate humans not vice versa). Because they consider bonobos to be a matriarchal sjw culture where males are violently controlled by females.

Except that the study is by a feminist and full of loopholes.

MurphyRise • 17 points • 3 August, 2017 10:14 PM

Imagine Adam Ruins Jordan Peterson.

GayLubeOil • 54 points • 4 August, 2017 02:14 AM

Imagine Adam Ruins his body by eating like an unattended child for 12 years. Oh wait we don't have to imagine.

HumanSockPuppet • 6 points • 4 August, 2017 08:32 AM

Just a few more dinners of ice cream and ketchup and he'll be ready to take on the Patriarchy™.

[deleted] • 17 points • 4 August, 2017 10:26 AM

"Girls dont really like muscular men. My girlfriend told me that"----Adam

chaosmech • 3 points • 4 August, 2017 01:04 PM

"-- while choking on Chad's cum. It's ok, she loves me more... she said so!" -- Adam, probably.

[deleted] • 9 points • 4 August, 2017 02:19 PM

I wonder what the correlation between body fat % and cuckoldry is

[deleted] • 5 points • 4 August, 2017 02:19 PM

I wonder what the correlation between body fat % and cuckoldry is

[deleted] • 6 points • 4 August, 2017 02:19 PM

I wonder what the correlation between body fat % and cuckoldry is

jackandjill22 • 7 points • 4 August, 2017 02:04 AM

Jordan Peterson's really killing it lately.

[deleted] • 13 points • 3 August, 2017 08:34 PM

He got banned from YouTube recently.

MissNietzsche • 19 points • 3 August, 2017 08:45 PM

His Google account was restored pretty soon afterward, thankfully.

stretchmarx20 • 1 point • 7 August, 2017 07:40 PM

I can't imagine anything more beta than listening to Jordan Peterson podcasts

HoldDatCrew • 158 points • 3 August, 2017 05:53 PM

This video will actually harm men. What a huge shit-test, to weed out simps that don't get this vid is all bullshit!
Reminder that all feminist dogma is a huge shit-test for men.

PinHunter65 • 53 points • 3 August, 2017 08:08 PM

The people who watch this, and are actually effected by it...are the ones who are too brain dead to bring back anyway.

HoldDatCrew • 25 points • 3 August, 2017 08:34 PM

you are probably not far from the truth, sadly.

PinHunter65 • 3 points • 4 August, 2017 04:31 PM

Just think about it. There are 2 types of people. The ones who watch shit like this and laugh their asses off. And the ones who actually believe it. It sounds dumb, but Hitler convinced an entire country with the help of propaganda.

KatanaRunner • 12 points • 4 August, 2017 02:54 AM

Reminder that all feminist dogma is a huge shit-test for men.

Indeed, have a redpill-upvote.

cherryCanSuckMyDick • 8 points • 4 August, 2017 02:09 AM

TBH even before discovering TRP I had the common sense to know dating a single mom was a bad idea.
Most men know better. The ones that dont will learn

[deleted] • 253 points • 3 August, 2017 04:48 PM

Feminism is big fucking money in the entertainment industry. I work in the music industry and I've seen it first hand with Beyoncé hijacking the feminist narrative for profit. Masculinity is seen as toxic so you can't make

money off of it.

we_kill_creativity • 162 points • 3 August, 2017 06:06 PM

Is that what happened with *gangsta* rap? No...seriously, is that what happened there? It just kind of stopped all of a sudden and the current breed of rappers all look, sound, and talk like little boys going through puberty.

Gadnuk_ • 81 points • 3 August, 2017 10:03 PM

Gangsta rap has been rife with redpill truths for decades.

They were some of the earliest to identify AWALT principles, branch swinging, alpha fucks vs beta bucks etc., likely realizing that despite the Disney narrative the chicks were ignoring good hard working nice guys in favor of abusive drug dealers and badass gangsters.

"Bitches ain't shit but hos and tricks"

"A bitch is a bitch"

"We don't love these hoes"

"Bitch, I'm out yo pussy when I nut, for real"

"I'm the type to wear a bullet proof condom and still pull out"

They saw their fellow black men being used and abused by women and wrote street poetry to tell the tale. Nothing happens in a vacuum, and sexist lyrics weren't just a coincidence. Tupac was a real nice guy in his earlier work until he was hit with a phony sexual assault charge, you can literally hear his anger phase in his later music.

hawkeaglejesus • 14 points • 4 August, 2017 03:07 PM

2pac got redpilled hard

dizzyoak1 • 9 points • 4 August, 2017 01:21 PM

"I'm the type to wear a bullet proof condom and still pull out"

Big Sean wouldn't be the best reference to use if you're gonna talk about "gangsta rap".

Gadnuk_ • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 04:17 PM

Yeah I know but that line is still evidence of RP in hip hop. They know thots scamming for a meal ticket

Actanonverbal1 • 4 points • 5 August, 2017 01:04 PM

Tupac learned the hard way that bitches ain't shit.

enuab • 2 points • 5 August, 2017 08:21 PM

"If that bitch can't make me rich then ain't no need for fucking with her, turn around I'll fuck her sister, heard that bitch got EBT" Vince Staples

[deleted] • 126 points • 3 August, 2017 06:44 PM

Look at how beta Jay Z has gotten. Beyoncé is the alpha in that relationship.

I'm assuming you mean the new breed of trap music known as "mumble rap" coming out of Atlanta, Chicago, and New York. I can't say for sure but I think it's a combination of the influence of southern

accents and abuse of codeine cough syrup. Add in a little ghetto fabulous flair and you have rappers like Chief Keef, Desiigner, Migos etc...

Gangsta rap isn't dead. The west coast is still holding on strong. Look at TDE and the members of Black Hippy. Kendrick, Schoolboy Q, Ab Soul, and Jay Rock are going on strong.

follow_that_rabbit • 56 points • 3 August, 2017 07:39 PM

Can't remember where but i read an article that said that beyonce made jay z apologize for the use of the words faggot, gay and such in his first albums like Reasonable Doubt, Blueprint etc. It's sad that an icon of my youth went down like that just because of his marriage that was 100% a marketing move and a merge between 2 great firms

dr_warlock • 29 points • 4 August, 2017 01:01 AM*

Jay Z, a billionaire, giving any shits about what millionaires and the plebs think. Either he's beta or someone higher up the foodchain is pressuring him. The latter is a scary thought.

[deleted] • 29 points • 4 August, 2017 03:53 AM

well, his wives sister slapped the shit out of him, so that should answer your question

dizzyoak1 • 7 points • 4 August, 2017 01:23 PM

He would've been in deep shit if he hit back cuz ya know *equality*. I think he handled it well and didn't seem to fazed by it.

lipidsly • 4 points • 4 August, 2017 09:32 AM

Well hes also been fucking as many bitches as he wants. So

pulpfrictionns • 2 points • 5 August, 2017 06:58 AM

Lol are you sure he isn't just keeping a nice public image to ensure the success of his brands

[deleted] • 10 points • 4 August, 2017 04:15 AM

At least Nas is still real. He's the most redpilled man in the music industry.

Edit - also the greatest rapper alive

follow_that_rabbit • 9 points • 4 August, 2017 11:48 AM*

Slim Shady. He maybe eclipsed himself a little but he still doesn't give a single fuck about what people thinks.

Also he can definitely spit

chadjugo • 1 points • 5 August, 2017 01:09 AM **[recovered]**

"I don't sell crack I smoke it"

"I'm so high, I don't even know what label I'm on"

That Weed Lacer freestyle put him in my top 10.

pulpfrictionns • 3 points • 5 August, 2017 04:44 PM

Who the fuck was in it before lol

Pooddit • 1 points • 3 August, 2017 07:24 PM [recovered]

It used to be a guide for the most emasculated people, black men, to rise up and develop respect as men in a society who took everything from them. I'm talking like Tupac here. Now it's the opposite. Retard yourself on drugs and alcohol, ineligible lyrics, some chirping noises.

[deleted] • 65 points • 3 August, 2017 07:26 PM

Definitely. Young black men are looking up to these guys as their heroes. All it will do is get them hooked on opioids, in trouble with gangs and the law, and perpetuate poverty and violence in their neighborhoods.

At least Tupac had a political conscious.

lispsychicken • 14 points • 3 August, 2017 09:13 PM

and I was just told recently here on reddit that music doesnt influence our youth. Told this by someone who didnt want that to be true, of course.

natetheproducer • 17 points • 3 August, 2017 10:12 PM

Lolol yeah cuz highschool kids never tried to act like drake before or idolized migos or nicki minaj before.

lispsychicken • 7 points • 4 August, 2017 03:33 PM

as soon as some popular musician has a style, it's copied by some dumb 16yr old.. hell we all did it. I'm old enough to have worn Hammer pants because "that cool MC Hammer guy does". How many kids thought being a gangbanger was cool because NWA and Ice T spoke about it? a LOT!

But when you try to hold those musicians and that culture responsible, it's "no, it's just music, it doesnt influence like that".. it's such an ignorant statement to make, it has me wondering if secretly, there's a culture-hating group out there purposely trying to downplay the truth.

mummersfarce_is_done • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 11:02 PM

It might be a reptilian trick.

xRisingSunx • 35 points • 3 August, 2017 10:27 PM

Yep Kids never did drugs like the Beatles, or became whores like Madonna, or sold drugs like Biggie Smalls, or donned skinny jeans like Fallout Boy. None of that music had ANY influence on youth culture, Nope sure didn't (closes ears) LALALA LALALALA LALALA /s

Dont_StopBelievin • 8 points • 3 August, 2017 09:41 PM

You'd really appreciate Immortal Technique then.

ShotgunTRP • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 10:29 AM

I always put on my trusty tinfoil hat before chucking on some IT

Lo-G • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 11:11 AM

WE. WUZ. VIKINGS

Shieeeeeet

neck-yourself • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 09:41 PM

i like Buddy. good music and a good message.

MuleJuiceMcQuaid • 17 points • 3 August, 2017 11:16 PM

Gangsta rap isn't dead. The west coast is still holding on strong.

Houston is still putting out great music that isn't mumble rap.

Just being from the south and high off codeine isn't an excuse to put out garbage music, otherwise UGK would've been shit. Chicago/Atlanta rappers legit can't speak English even in interviews because they are being raised in a pocket third-world county. This video is an example..

wanderer779 • 4 points • 4 August, 2017 02:50 AM

He can't speak, but it doesn't matter cause he has no information to convey in the first place. So it all worked out in the end.

acetylcysteine • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 05:14 AM

my whole thought on this "new rap" is that it sells to the masses (aka white girls and white teen boys). growing up i mostly listened to rap and my music choices were always laughed upon/frowned upon jokingly by my friends.

Actanonverbal1 • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 01:07 PM

Kendrick is the real shit. An Soul and Jay Rock are good, too.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 August, 2017 06:20 PM

Black Hippy and the A\$AP Mob are my 2 fav crews these days, easily

Rap is all about people going from the rock bottom SMV to the top of the food chain and writing the most red pilld songs on women. It's fantastic.

[deleted] • 0 points • 4 August, 2017 03:40 AM

Lol gangsta rap is dead! Rap is dead! Only in America as a matter of fact gangster rap immigrated to the UK

nevertellalie2017 • 4 points • 6 August, 2017 02:09 AM

No it did not lmao UK don't got shit on America's rap scene

[deleted] • 25 points • 3 August, 2017 06:41 PM*

Personally i had a similar idea. Rap, like Geto Boys, Cypress Hill, Ice Cube yada yada. Overnight it changed to being all about bling bling.

Get people away from knowing about hardships of inter city life and get them doing something useful from an economic robber baron stand point like everyone else. Use the rappers as a vehicle to promote hyper consumerism.

vengefully_yours • 13 points • 3 August, 2017 07:35 PM

That's how we got \$200 pos chevy four doors on 24" rims painted with product logos like Twix bars.

acetylcysteine • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 05:16 AM

exactly and rap about "fashion" and clothes to get women to buy your products (or their bfs to buy it for them)

Lateralanouncer • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:27 PM

That is basically the system. Make woman attracted to shiny objects and men will enslave them self to have stuff. Ie. I have a Lamborghini and now I am attractive.

WhorehouseVet • 10 points • 3 August, 2017 06:38 PM

We need more of these rappers.

<https://youtu.be/dKBUUXm0eow>

HappyMexican • 17 points • 3 August, 2017 06:27 PM

Dude I was just listening to DMX last night and wondering wtf has this music disappeared too.

[deleted] • 12 points • 3 August, 2017 07:12 PM

DMX ran into some drug and legal issues that has set him back. He's no longer on a major label but he put out an album not too long ago. Dude looks like he's wasting away

sourdieselfuel • 20 points • 3 August, 2017 07:50 PM

Lol he crashed his car through an airport gate and tried to claim he was part of the FBI.

BullshittingNonsense • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 08:27 PM

Now he is also being investigated for tax evasion.

ShotgunTRP • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 10:31 AM

Don't get more badass than thay

nevertellalie2017 • 3 points • 5 August, 2017 05:11 AM

Check out Vince Staples, YG's Still Brazy album(his other albums aren't as good), Schoolboy Q, Denzel Curry, and many more but I can't think of them right now.

That's for some aggressive rap, if you want some conscious rap there are some today as well.

[deleted] • 16 points • 3 August, 2017 06:56 PM

While the US rap/hip hop scene is getting worse, here in the UK, artists like Skepta and Bugzy Malone have recently started to be making great grime music (British Rap) which appeals to a lot of masculine men. I'd recommend people who miss old rap to give it a listen.

Idosinrbfj • 9 points • 3 August, 2017 08:12 PM

Recently started? The British grime scene has been on this for a solid ten years with the OG's like Tempa T, Crazy Titch etc recently it has just become mainstream with skepta and then Stormzy followed suit. But then proving mainstream influences his song "Birthday Girl" is so feminine as well (catchy though I can't deny)

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 08:22 PM

Yeah the point I was trying to make that it is now mainstream. I was a fan of Stormzy's early

music but I don't like the direction he's taking, doing songs with girlbands disappointed me.

Idosinrbfj • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 08:23 PM

Same as everything man, Krept and Konan fell off a bit as well I think

ShotgunTRP • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 10:31 AM

Dizzy rascal blew that shit out at least ten years ago

Huskimbo9 • 9 points • 3 August, 2017 07:24 PM

This is why you turn off the radio and listen to underground music ,check out Roc Marciano ,Curren\$y,Willie the kid ,Sean Price etc.

DotishGuy • 10 points • 3 August, 2017 06:30 PM

Even groups like onyx don't sound as rough as they used to
Everyone's becoming soft

biggerbetterjobs • 9 points • 3 August, 2017 07:10 PM

There's lots of good current rappers. They're just not in the mainstream because they don't promote using opiates to impressionable teenagers with low quality yet catchy lyrics.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BSM7QejzUpQ>

colucci • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 07:18 PM

Lol how do you find more stuff like this?

You say anything remotely bad about most established rappers and you'll get your post removed.
I hate everything Kendrick has put out since GKMC and he sounds like a prepubescent girl now.
Apparently mods there disagree.

nevertellalie2017 • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 05:13 AM

TPAB was a classic. You gotta listen to it through the whole thing front to back.

L04TSK4 • 1 points • 3 August, 2017 06:40 PM **[recovered]**

I think hip hop moved to a feminine-pop sound around the year 2000.

The first song that made me realize that was Me and My Girlfriend - Jay Z.

PM_YOUR_SIDE_CLUNGE • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 06:57 PM

(hed) p.e. did a nice tribute to that in a track called Girlfriend from the New World Orphans album

Redfiddler • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 08:19 PM

<https://youtu.be/ue5oHmUGiMM>

snowdope • 1 points • 4 August, 2017 02:21 AM **[recovered]**

careful with Cole. He's also made an entire song about Folding clothes.
He literally did save a hoe and is folding clothes for her.

nevertellalie2017 • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 05:14 AM

captain save a hoe

JLM268 • 3 points • 4 August, 2017 01:25 AM

Kendrick, SchoolboyQ, Vince Staples?

farooq7 • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 09:16 PM

Freddie Gibbs, Trouble, Nipsey Hussle. Loads of dudes out there killin it

balalasaurus • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 10:23 PM

Trap is the new gangsta rap. More shallow over all, but if you want entertainment that actually talks about the best mindset for women with men, you should check it out. Artists like Gucci Mane are real. More real than any of the mainstream trash you hear nowadays.

KnowBrainer • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 07:22 PM

Search YouTube for Zuse. He's pretty gangsta.

Mainstream only plays pop music, you have to search deeper to find the real stuff.

joh2141 • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:52 AM

<https://youtu.be/wzMrK-aGCug>

Like this? Rap these days are a joke where looking flashy and all talk is everything.

nevertellalie2017 • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 05:16 AM

Only teenage girls listen to this I'm not even playing.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 August, 2017 03:32 PM

The new names are even more redpilled than old. Listen to someone like lil yachty or kodak black, they redpill hard in there songs. Look up "from D to the A", "Dirty Mouth", "Tunnel Vision". They basically say in all their songs, fuck bitches get money. Only new rapper I can think of that is beta is Lil Uzi Vert.

maximus1487 • 3 points • 4 August, 2017 04:20 AM

I remember Cee-Lo Green talking about masculinity and confronting a journalist that critized him for his display of "macho" attitudes. He was basically black listed in the industry for this.

wanderer779 • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 02:38 AM

I have sons and would pay double for movies that don't celebrate simping. I guess it's not a big enough market though.

Pshkn11 • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 08:54 PM

"Masculinity is seen as toxic so you can't make money off of it" tell that to Alex Jones

OneLifeSucks • 104 points • 3 August, 2017 05:15 PM

As part of my community service I've been helping with this no contact boxing program for old people with parkinsons and it's cemented in my mind that "alpha" is a thing. I'm working with 15 or so dudes all in their late 60's at least and you can just tell who the studs were back in the day. It's not to say the other guys are less of a man or anything like that, they just don't have "it" and I'm not going by body type or even profession as what

they did before retirement doesn't seem to correlate much with their presence in person.

fakenate1 • 16 points • 4 August, 2017 01:17 AM

How do you have no contact boxing?

OneLifeSucks • 2 points • 5 August, 2017 05:58 PM

They do the workouts and hit punching bags and dummies.

[deleted] • -19 points • 3 August, 2017 07:01 PM

Yes and no. I get what you're saying. But I've met some boxers that are beta as all heavens.

Imjustkidding • 35 points • 3 August, 2017 07:38 PM

Where did he say all boxers are alpha? You just reiterated what he said.

[deleted] • -18 points • 3 August, 2017 07:53 PM

Yeah I didn't word it well.

I am assuming that boxers my age never really lose some really subconscious instinct on how to throw a jab or a hook as they grow older. Yet I've met a shit ton of boxers my age that can throw a punch but are beta as fuck.

Where I'm going with this is that if a 60 year old man can throw a punch, it don't necessarily mean he was alpha or not.

phohunnid • 1 points • 3 August, 2017 08:00 PM **[recovered]**

You're missing the point. The boxing part is arbitrary. He's saying he can clearly tell who the alphas of their time were.

halfback910 • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 12:53 AM

Honestly the boxing part had *literally nothing* to do with it at all! It was just what they were doing at the time when he noticed them.

"I've been attending ice cream socials lately because the farmers harvest the milk fresh and make the ice cream themselves the way it was intended and it's honestly just divine. I also meet really interesting people, and even here it's clear who is alpha and who is not."

"Bro, I've seen people at ice cream socials that are TOTAL fucking pansies."

[deleted] • 16 points • 3 August, 2017 08:45 PM

You shouldn't talk just to hear yourself speak

vengefully_yours • 11 points • 3 August, 2017 08:13 PM

Yeah that's what he is saying. You can tell who is and who isn't by simply being around them.

Im_no_imposter • 121 points • 3 August, 2017 05:30 PM

It claims that aggressive behaviour and an angered state of mind portrays what an "alpha male" is, whereas in actuality a real alpha male isn't irascible and remains nonchalant but stern.

Zenonlite • 84 points • 3 August, 2017 05:57 PM

Yeah, the whole video stinks of the Strawman Fallacy since they're misconstruing what an "alpha male" is.

They also don't even acknowledge the sexual attraction aspect of it. (They only briefly mention that women are attracted to alphas in the beginning but then they never address it again).

BullshittingNonsense • 30 points • 3 August, 2017 08:29 PM

Meanwhile all the guys just about to get red pillled are thinking: "Yeah it does seem like women all go for that kind of guy... Oh wait the 'funny' man is talking again. Let me pay attention."

kellykebab • 16 points • 4 August, 2017 01:00 AM

The entire video is a massive straw man patched together with non sequiturs. There's a bizarre transition where he switches from criticizing alpha males to alpha wolves as if they're the same thing. No one gives a fuck about alpha wolves. Such a slimy trick.

I already hate that 'Adam' type (i.e. conventional wisdom is *always* the opposite of reality, only I have the true answer, nuance never exists), but the agenda is so utterly blatant with everything this guy says. Like every moment is scripted perfectly for disgruntled 21 year olds who have never held a job.

Such ridiculous pandering.

halfback910 • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 12:55 AM

Yeah I already fucking despised him from unrelated beliefs I hold that he's ridiculed. And he handwaved this stuff the same way he handwaved my other, more important stuff. Just makes me hate him more in all honesty.

On the majority of his controversial political points if he actually went up against a proponent of that ideology who could refute him in a debate, he would be crushed utterly.

kellykebab • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 01:15 AM

The guy is clearly in the entertainment business, but it's boring entertainment masquerading as irreverent education.

Out of curiosity, what are your other views that he criticizes?

halfback910 • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 01:18 AM

I'm an Ancap and he never outright criticizes Anarcho-Capitalism but he has a bunch of videos whose subtitles are more or less "FUCK LIBERTARIANS! :D"

"Here's why we NEED NEED NEED THE GOVERNMENT!"

"Capitalism is AWFUL AND HERE'S WHY!"

"Thank GOD for the government!"

"MUH ROOOOADS!"

Capitalism is essentially TRP applied to everything that's not sex. In case you're like me and crushing pussy is not your *highest* aspiration. The sum of your contribution to society can be calculated by your salary and possessions. Because the market has given you back value equal to what you gave it. To me, there's something fair and beautiful about that.

DynamicPressure • 49 points • 3 August, 2017 07:25 PM

It also implies that any form of anger or aggression is weakness.

I get the sense that shaming male "aggression" or "anger" is a manipulative tactic to force men to submit to the whim of a decaying civilization.

There are times when you should be angry and aggressive and fight back. It's a good and necessary emotion to have when harnessed, directed, and controlled.

If another man attempts to capture your village, kill your brothers, rape your women, are you going to be nonchalant? No.

"Suffering is the origin of consciousness." - Dostoevsky

I admire the stoics but they seem resigned to the idea of enduring suffering without reaction. Seems like slavery to me.

vengefully_yours • 42 points • 3 August, 2017 07:49 PM

Stoic also means you do not lament killing the invaders. You don't start shit unless you have to, but if someone starts shit with you make damn sure you finish it. "He pulls a knife, you pull a gun. He sends one of yours to the hospital, you send one of his to the morgue!" Peace through superior firepower. Speak softly and carry a big stick.

It's not roll over and let them take what they want while you cower in the corner. They want us to be passive, non aggressive, cowering and dependent upon them so we don't bite the hand that feeds us the scraps.

ChadThundercockII • 3 points • 4 August, 2017 01:10 AM

I live in a part of the world where doped up faggots harass and steal from honest working people, at knife point. I engage in criminal activities myself, but still from poor people who work 12 hours a day and have a family to support so you can buy more drugs is not how I see a man carry himself. The government is corrupt and often uses these people to terrorize the population and create a need for their structure. That's basic every day life in a 3rd world country. the question is: do I gather a group of like minded men and start planting knives in the necks of these low-lives?

Im_no_imposter • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 10:45 PM

Yeah I should've mentioned that despite what I said, alphas are not afraid to act aggressively if it's necessary.

PMnewb • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 08:39 PM

You misunderstand Stoicism. You don't resign yourself to suffering and do nothing about it, letting it continue. That would be retarded.

Instead, you acknowledge the suffering and accept that it's happening *now*, but you don't let it cloud your judgement or emotionally compromise your ability to act. A clear head is necessary for right action, and right action is the way to change the circumstance that causes suffering.

Future_Alpha • 12 points • 3 August, 2017 07:57 PM

I admire the stoics but they seem resigned to the idea of enduring suffering without reaction. Seems like slavery to me.

You just described Christians.

Stoics do not suffer for the sake of suffering. They just understand that suffering is inevitable and accept it. They are pragmatic about it. That is the difference.

Onan_Barbarian • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 11:10 PM

Whether 'tis nobler to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune...

Future_Alpha • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 11:23 PM

...Or to take arms against a sea of troubles - and by confronting, end them.

cherryCanSuckMyDick • 11 points • 4 August, 2017 02:13 AM

whereas in actuality a real alpha male isn't irascible and remains nonchalant but stern.

I like to think the best example of an alpha is Gandalf. Hes friendly, warm, and the truest friend you could ever ask for, but he doesnt kiss anybodys ass, he speaks his mind frankly when necessary, and he doesnt tolerate fools lightly.

And guess what. Everybody. Fucking. Loves. Him.

KnowBrainer • 10 points • 3 August, 2017 08:05 PM

It just illustrates that feminists don't even understand themselves. Hens cluck.

bowlin_forsalad • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:30 AM

Most people who are dogs in a system don't understand the nature of their role.

bowlin_forsalad • 5 points • 4 August, 2017 12:27 AM

Lord Tywin Lannister of Casterly Rock is confirmed alpha male

Htowngetdown • 24 points • 3 August, 2017 06:47 PM

Yup, there is a war on "male-ness." Just look at this article from TIME Magazine about "toxic masculinity" <http://imgur.com/a/YbWoM>

Rollo-Tomassi • 28 points • 4 August, 2017 03:08 AM

All this is is a straw man based on a woman's ridicule and then parroted back as some lame attempt to AMOG the Alpha men that Betas despise.

You'll notice that they entirely ignore the well documented facts about women and Ovulatory Shift. They ignore that women prefer masculine, dominant men in their pre-ovulatory phase and feminized men in their luteal phase. This never gets mentioned, because it's too inconvenient.

Neither do they want to confront the well-documented fact that Hypergamy creates masculine dominance hierarchies. Instead they focus on terminology without considering that the term Alpha is an abstraction of an idea. They do this because they already accept that men are ridiculous and follow it up by more self-defeating ridicule of men (themselves) in the hope that it will absolve women of their true sexual preferences, Hypergamy and maybe seem endearing to some woman, somewhere, because they've been taught that vulnerability in men is Game.

onyxcrown • 57 points • 3 August, 2017 05:16 PM

It's a shame really. I have enjoyed Adam ruins everything for a few years but that video is just pandering garbage pushing a narrative.

ex_addict_bro • 27 points • 3 August, 2017 05:22 PM

Some CH videos seemed like they're a bit red pill in their nature, for example that trans-everything short was funny.

tallwheel • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 07:09 AM

A few, but nowadays they have so many feminist and SJW pandering bullshit videos and comics. It's pathetic.

neck-yourself • 9 points • 3 August, 2017 09:49 PM

yeah i loved the one where they said "virginity isn't real, its just a tool of the patriarchy to shame women for being promiscuous." such science. wow. great show.

vicious_armbar • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:46 PM

Can you dig up a link? That sounds so ridiculous it's funny! This bits on YouTube used to be decent, but now they're all sjw garbage.

neck-yourself • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 03:23 PM

here you go my man <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=likXim4wevc>

lolmonade • 24 points • 3 August, 2017 05:52 PM

Did you see the weight loss one? All the interesting factoids only to stop at the conclusion that "lol, you can't lose weight, accept your tubby body".

Cmon, at least arrive at the conclusion that your focus should be about sustained healthy choices and moderate exercise, rather than fat acceptance.

vengefully_yours • 19 points • 3 August, 2017 07:52 PM

Fuck it, everything is too hard, too difficult to do, you'll never achieve anything so why TRY? That's the attitude I play when people roll their eyes and call bullshit when I mention I fuck hot young girls half my age easily. I put in the work, achieved the difficult, did the formerly impossible a few times as well, and now I reap the benefits. It's not all that arduous or impossible, but you need to grow up and do it. Giving up before you start is what they want.

AngriestBeaver • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 06:23 AM

That episode infuriated me. I get that weight loss shows don't really care about long term weight loss or health of contestants, and diets are not one size fits all, but the conclusion came off as give up and don't try because it's out of your hands. They even tried to make a case there isn't an obesity epidemic. Fuck that, there is overwhelming evidence of an obesity and diabetes epidemic in the states.

Sir_Distic • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 07:11 PM

I watched that video this morning. It annoyed me. I like Adam Ruins Everything but that was trash. So overdone.

ar4s • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 02:13 AM

Maybe that says more about what you know, than what he does?

tallwheel • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 07:07 AM

Did you see the video game one? He actually tried to claim that there are just as many girl gamers as boy gamers (cause Candy Crush is just as much a gamer's game as Call of Duty, amirite?).

ThePantsThief • 1 point • 7 August, 2017 10:08 PM

I've always hated it. He has such a punchable face.

SkorchZang • 18 points • 3 August, 2017 08:36 PM*

The "friendly Marxism with a human face" agitprop undertones couldn't be more obvious.

It is afraid.

[deleted] • 41 points • 3 August, 2017 05:50 PM

I watched it for a good laugh and when I scrolled down to the comments section, it was filled with real Alphas and Red Pills. It's glorious.

Queefums • 15 points • 3 August, 2017 08:27 PM

Eh I was just looking and all the top comments are mocking guys who think of themselves as alpha

[deleted] • 5 points • 4 August, 2017 12:41 AM

Comment section was worthy as a post itself; it shows a wide array of people's support and opinion on what 'alpha' is. There's people calling others who believe the video betas. People defending masculinity and the concept of alpha males against feminist. People saying that alphas are aggressive, assertive, abusive assholes. Other's pointing out the misconstrued definition of alpha to a selfish cocky prick (aka bad boy) instead of the confident in control real man.

A lot of the misunderstanding to people seems to be that alphas are assertive and aggressive. While it may seem similar it is entirely different. Anyone can be assertive, however, alphas need to make a proposal and seal the deal. Saying what you want and getting what you want are two different things requiring a gaping gap of different qualification. Alphas also aren't aggressive physically as much as socially, this misunderstanding can be attributed to how most alphas will be fit from lifting and that natural pseudo alphas are mostly athletes, large intimidating males and edgy sketchy hipsters. Of course these natural pseudo males don't have the control and understanding of real alphas so they can be anger and will be tempted into being physical.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 04:39 AM

All alphas fight. Chimpanzees, the animal people always point to when making cases for human behavior, typically attain their alpha status by beating the shit out of the old alpha and ruling over the other chimps with an iron fist.

You punching me in the face and kicking my ass would be the most alpha thing in the world if I were better than you. However, humans don't look at it like that and see people who fight as weak and cowardly, considering all the comments about stoicism being better than aggressive/emotional responses.

Humans don't have alphas in the standard alpha/beta dynamic sense. There are definitely leaders, strong men, etc, but no alphas. If people want to label the human alpha as 'alpha' for ease of language, that's one thing, but people saying there aren't any human alphas is a very legit statement.

halfback910 • 2 points • 5 August, 2017 01:03 AM

Only because physical confrontation is their only form of confrontation, right?

We have other forms of confrontation. That doesn't make it not confrontation? And it doesn't make it not valid confrontation. In an animal society, physical attributes are the ones that matter. Therefore proving your physical attributes are superior is enough to demonstrate to 100% satisfaction that you are superior. For the majority of animals, mental faculties make very little difference.

That's not true for humans. I know people who could beat the shit out of me who are not superior to me/more useful than me in human society. Whereas a chimp who can beat the shit out of another chimp is totally more useful.

It's part of why humans have always been into debate and arguments. That is a very real, very visible confrontation where one person emerges the victor almost unquestionably. People who are correct, smart, well-spoken, are useful. They are winners, good, etc. And debate is a confrontation that demonstrates that.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 11:55 PM

Dude, I said that humans and chimps are different for that exact reason. And usefulness doesn't mean superiority - If you're useful to me to get me into a club where I end up ditching your bitch ass, then how superior are you to me?

Besides, most people don't respect shit talkers. In fact, most people really don't give af about anything intellectual. There's a reason self-proclaimed intellects sit there and bitch about small talk and cry about how people don't want to talk about the intricacies of economic systems or other political topics.

Besides, the guy said 'assertive and aggressive', and how human alphas are stoic and rational. That's a juxtaposition, dawg (or it's not, but IDC if I'm using the term 100% accurately), and if debate is a form of confrontation, then it must also be assertive and aggressive, meaning it's beta by that guy's definition of what human alphas are.

TL;DR - There are no human alphas.

halfback910 • 1 point • 6 August, 2017 01:09 AM

Oh, goodness, me.

And usefulness doesn't mean superiority

Well, yes it does. You obviously have to capitalize on your usefulness. Essentially the only meaningful way of measuring usefulness to society is wealth and salary. That is the market giving you what you are worth. In terms of being worth something to someone else, we can't measure that. That's useless to us. Social behavior is about what benefits the society. That's why societies operate the way they do. And wealth is an excellent way of measuring social value.

Besides, most people don't respect shit talkers.

It's not about shit-talking.

In fact, most people really don't give af about anything intellectual.

I hate to break it to you, but the economy and society are now overwhelmingly intellectual in nature. Let's ignore this, frankly moronic, idea you have that intellect is bearded men sitting around talking about economics. Intellect is simply using your mental faculties as opposed to your physical ones. Barring Cristiano Ronaldo and a *handful* of other physical specimens the

vast, overwhelming majority of the global élite, the wealthy, etc. got there not by kicking a ball or by moving heavy things up and down "real gud", but by being smarter and providing valuable tools and services to the market. Unfortunately, facts don't care about our feelings, and the facts simply do not bear out what you are saying.

Besides, the guy said 'assertive and aggressive', and how human alphas are stoic and rational.

You can peruse my other comments. I fucking hate this Adam guy and think he's a mongoloid retard. You'll have no argument from me there.

and if debate is a form of confrontation, then it must also be assertive and aggressive,

It is. See above. Aggression doesn't necessarily need to be physical. The only reason why animal aggression is 100% physical is because physicality is 100% of what matters to them. Physicality is like <20% of what matters to humans. Can you make a living moving heavy things up and down? Barely. But any decent living you're going to make in human society is going to involve mental faculties at least somewhat, including skilled labor. There's a reason construction workers make more than street sweepers despite also working with their hands: They gotta know shit.

meaning it's beta by that guy's definition of what human alphas are.

Uh, I guess. I lost track after like the third comma. Again, I don't like Adam and think he's an idiot.

There are no human alphas.

Only if you accept on face that physical aggression is the only form of aggression, physical superiority is the only form of superiority, etc. etc. Which I do not.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 1 point • 6 August, 2017 02:04 AM

Well, yes it does.

I used to use my friend all the time for his pool because I didn't have one. He isn't superior to me, since he let me use him for it. You sound like the guy who justifies why he's not actually dead inside busting his ass at work because his ~~owner~~ boss complimented him on how big of an 'asset' he is to the company.

It's not about shit-talking.

Point is, if you try to push your glasses up and debate me, and I punch you in the face, you're now nothing but a shit talker to most people since you invited conflict thinking nothing would happen to you.

Let's ignore this, frankly moronic, idea you have that intellect is bearded men sitting around talking about economics.

Hey, superior intellect guy, I was being facetious painting that picture. That was more of a jab at you and other self-professed intellectuals, the ones who correct people's grammar, as if properly placed punctuation, makes any, difference, in what, someone's, point was, .

You knew exactly what I meant when I said nobody gives a shit about intellectualism. Try flexing your vocabulary (like calling people specimens) to any average person. I guarantee

you they'll think deep down that you're a neckbeard.

I fucking hate this Adam guy and think he's a mongoloid retard

I don't check people's post history, so I'm good.

It is. See above.

I wasn't arguing that it was passive. I was, however, under the impression you were in agreement with that Adam guy. That's why I said that arguing with someone and getting punched in the face makes you a shit talking wimp if you lose.

Uh, I guess. I lost track after like the third comma. Again, I don't like Adam and think he's an idiot.

I Am Very Smart.

Only if you accept on face that physical aggression is the only form of aggression, physical superiority is the only form of superiority, etc. etc. Which I do not.

I'm basing my opinion on the fact that most societies were egalitarian (even hunter/gatherer societies), that the 'alpha' of the board room is a nobody elsewhere, that the alpha/beta dynamic displayed in species outside of our own typically function the same way with each other and are completely different from our own, and that we are mostly follow a leader/follower dynamic where everybody is typically both.

There's no such thing as being both the alpha and the beta. You're one or the other, but not with people. It'd be stupid to think that, just because people don't hit each other as much as they probably should, we have no alphas. It's more complex than that.

halfback910 • 2 points • 6 August, 2017 04:31 AM

Oh, good *lord*.

I used to use my friend all the time for his pool because I didn't have one. He isn't superior to me, since he let me use him for it. You sound like the guy who justifies why he's not actually dead inside busting his ass at work because his owner boss complimented him on how big of an 'asset' he is to the company.

I literally said in my post that your value is what you get paid. I don't give a fuck about compliments, I work for money. I'm a mercenary. When I was quitting my last job my boss asked me "What about *loyalty*?"

Just like that. "What about *loyalty*?"

I said that as soon as *insert employer here* starts accepting loyalty as payment for their services I would too.

Point is, if you try to push your glasses up and debate me, and I punch you in the face, you're now nothing but a shit talker to most people since you invited conflict thinking nothing would happen to you.

Why do you think every hypothetical is in... a club or something? What if I'm challenging your position in the workplace? What if I'm (albeit politely) telling you you're full of shit and that your ideas are shit and if we used them we'd be shit too? Because I've done that. I've *had* to do that. What do you think would happen if you

punched me?

You seem like someone who hasn't worked a decent paying job at all, to be honest.

The fact that you think physical violence can be a dividend-yielding response to someone challenging you verbally in any situation belies your lack of experience in important situations. Yes, I believe *you* have never been in situations where conflict could not be resolved physically because I do not believe that *you* have ever been in a situation where your opinion has mattered or been sought on any matter of significance. After all, you're a person who... uses otherwise annoying friends... for their *pools*. Not exactly a hallmark of success, mooching off of friends for something as trivial and inexpensive as temporary access to a fucking pool. I had a pool since I moved out. And if I didn't getting access to another pool would be a *trivial* fucking matter involving an incredibly small amount of money. I certainly wouldn't thrust a friend I have no interest in upon myself for a Goddamn pool. That's up there with... inner city kids breaking open fire hydrants for the water to escape the heat.

It'd be stupid to think that, just because people don't hit each other as much as they probably should, we have no alphas. It's more complex than that.

You were the one who originally said we had no alphas. Quoting your original comment:

All alphas fight.

Hm.

Humans don't have alphas

HMMMMMMMM.

Let's just do a *quick* overview?

It'd be stupid to think that, just because people don't hit each other... we have no alphas

Okay...

All alphas fight.

Humans have no alphas

I'm going to go out on a limb and say that... you're just stupid? You've lost track of your own, incredibly simplistic position in a pretty short amount of time and your retort was more or less internet tough guy nonsense amounting to "YEAH WELL I'LL HIT YOU!" Color me not impressed or scared.

And I'm sure you'll follow up by doubling down on the ITG act. "Oh well let's meet see if you're so tough then!"

I'll preface by saying that I *will* gladly meet up with you if you are willing to come to my neck of the woods. I'm in New Jersey kind of close-ish to Philadelphia, just for reference. Free most weekends, preferably Sundays. Weeknights are really not ideal.

Pretty correct that human social hierarchies are fluid, somewhat.

Still, the traits that make a man alpha - confidence and dominance, will put you on the top of most social hierarchies. That bit about dungeons and dragons is really out of context.

TheOriginalWasBetter • 42 points • 3 August, 2017 06:11 PM

Most of the video is just him talking about animal behavior. Even if the origin of the term 'alpha male' is based on research that turned out to be wrong, so what? That's not an argument against the idea of what it means to be alpha. He then goes on to insinuate that being alpha means being a jerk, selfish, and antagonizing, which is not true. Just the same old strawman argument that not living your life based on other people's opinions is somehow being mean to them.

[deleted] • 50 points • 3 August, 2017 04:18 PM

As if you made me watch this PoS...

Marketing a moronic character as "Alpha" will be hilarious to some but it intellectually irks me...

mallardcove[S] • 61 points • 3 August, 2017 04:25 PM

No surprise they brought in the caricatures and ridiculous portrayals of what they think alpha men are, to push their narrative

What if I told you a real alpha man is actually calm/relaxed, and yet still finds a way to dominate the space he is in.

[deleted] • 30 points • 3 August, 2017 04:28 PM

That's why watching The Soprano's is better now than when it was released. Tony's rants on where the fuck have the Gary Cooper's gone, everybody is just whining etc makes me just sit there and think...

We're with you Tony

caPltaL1sm • 8 points • 3 August, 2017 07:22 PM

That is, for me, the number one show I've ever watched. And I'm comparing it to Breaking Bad, GoT, The Wire, True Detective, R&M...

Just utter perfection. That show changed my life. It is an existentialist show at its core, with Tony Soprano our anti-hero.

wracky272 • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 05:00 PM

I allow myself a few episodes of this or that per week, and right now it's been The Sopranos (I've never seen it before). I'm enjoying it thoroughly, especially the whole old school versus new school dynamic that they explore.

[deleted] • 9 points • 3 August, 2017 05:04 PM

It's critique of male feminisation is top notch. A lot of people say Chuck Palahniuk's critique in Fight Club was the best, and whilst it is good, the writers of The Soprano's definitely did it better

wracky272 • 13 points • 3 August, 2017 05:10 PM

Hey, I see no reason not to enjoy them both. I enjoyed a lot of the views on consumerism and possessions in Fight Club... yes I'm one of those trendy minimalists, shoot me. All I know is that a clean place is a big turn on for women, and I save a shitload of money by only buying stuff that I actually need.

we_kill_creativity • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 06:12 PM

yes I'm one of those trendy minimalists

Eh...I'd say improving your life instead of making up for it by improving your things is pretty red pill.

BullshittingNonsense • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 05:24 PM

Yeah I've watched the series 6 times and I'm on my 7th go around. It's commentary on American culture has gotten even more pointed with time. The perfect encapsulation of our era.

OneRedYear • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 05:28 PM

But Tony wasn't all that great was he? Bit of a whiner? bit of a mamas boy/mommy issues? Bit paranoid and scared? He was the very thing he was railing against.

Belmont_Trevor • 6 points • 3 August, 2017 07:07 PM

I think he was a beta that got put into a position that requires being an alpha because of relatives dying and odd circumstances. He had to go see a therapist and shit to deal with stress. But the narrative of the, admittedly fictional, story was he became more alpha as time went by. There were numerous occasions when he could have died but he survived and learned from it. But then really his wife cucked him.

caPltaLism • 10 points • 3 August, 2017 07:25 PM

Nah I think he was an Alpha at his core. if anything I think the phenomenon is the opposite, that he could have existed in a time when being an Alpha was accepted, but the changing of America leading to the birth of feminism conflicted with who he is.

So it's a matter of his environment around him clashing with his alpha nature. I definitely wouldn't describe him as beta, no way. Just because someone has some personality issues doesn't change their core affiliation.

Also, those issues were due to his shitty parents and upbringing. His mom was a bi-polar sociopath who psychologically tormented his son. His blood was alpha, but all that mommy conditioning probably influenced those beta behaviors /u/OneRedYear is referring to.

BullshittingNonsense • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 08:41 PM

He is 100% an alpha. Also this isn't an either/or thing. So many here fall into the "either he's an alpha or a beta" or "he showed weakness! beta!" when real life is way more complicated than that.

Real life has tremendous shades of gray, but at its core it is a dichotomy. Sure, Tony showed weakness sometimes and could be extremely beta (and going to a psychiatrist is not beta), but in the end, he was an alpha. That's why The Sopranos is so good. It embraces both the extreme shades of gray and bipolar nature of life. Tony did some awful, morally reprehensible things, which the show fully acknowledges and condemns. However, I don't think you can watch the show and not see Tony as a good guy at the end of it all.

mmishu • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 11:38 PM

I wish someone would revive redpillmedia so we can have discussions analyzing and

dissecting red pill truths in film and series.

wanderer779 • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 02:58 AM

Also never had the makings of a varsity athlete.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 07:02 PM

Yeah, classic projection. The left is doing the same shit and the evidence to prove it is mounting up

Komredd • -1 points • 3 August, 2017 10:36 PM

I'd think you're still a moron.

LandoChronus • 50 points • 3 August, 2017 04:58 PM

Jesus that video was atrocious. That's the first video I've watched of the series and I'm glad I never looked at it.

It's like they know they're full of shit so they don't even try to be convincing. Even the "alpha male" example is a total pussy feminist.

grandaddychimp • 13 points • 3 August, 2017 06:37 PM

They can say there is no such thing as an alpha male until they're blue in the face. You can't win a debate with hypergamy.

hehetymen • 11 points • 3 August, 2017 07:13 PM

As someone who works in the media myself I can attest first hand that the media and establishment structures doing all they can to attack real men is not by accident. It is by design. The goal is to weaken men and make them effeminate losers who are easy to walk over. Strong, masculine men are the #1 enemy to the global establishment.

If you're not bullshitting, that's a sinister agenda. I've heard people claim this before, that its why every aspect of our society, whether media, school, the law, is geared towards producing feminized men who can't stand up for themselves. I feel sorry for the poor bastards who grow up being pumped full of this nonsense with no male role models.

Mr-Kabuki • 12 points • 3 August, 2017 08:07 PM

That was me man for the longest time. I consumed shitty mainstream media and became a fat sack of estrogen who thought admitting my weaknesses made me strong lol.

Fuck that shit. I started lifting and taking cold showers, and working in myself and learned to not feel ashamed of my masunilunty. I'm extremely glad I found this community that can give young men like me good role models when it seems that masculinity has died in our culture.

the_one_tony_stark • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 09:44 AM

It doesn't help that the attack takes place on multiple fronts. Psychological, but also physical, with ADD "medication" and xeno-estrogens whenever you eat or drink out of most plastic containers.

Xeno-estrogens have a stronger estrogenic effect than regular estrogens.

Mr-Kabuki • 6 points • 3 August, 2017 08:07 PM

That was me man for the longest time. I consumed shitty mainstream media and became a fat sack of estrogen who thought admitting my weaknesses made me strong lol.

Fuck that shit. I started lifting and taking cold showers, and working in myself and learned to not feel ashamed of my masunilunty. I'm extremely glad I found this community that can give young men like me good role models when it seems that masculinity has died in our culture.

Mr-Kabuki • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 08:07 PM

That was me man for the longest time. I consumed shitty mainstream media and became a fat sack of estrogen who thought admitting my weaknesses made me strong lol.

Fuck that shit. I started lifting and taking cold showers, and working in myself and learned to not feel ashamed of my masunilunty. I'm extremely glad I found this community that can give young men like me good role models when it seems that masculinity has died in our culture.

[deleted] • 26 points • 3 August, 2017 08:50 PM

Same shit different day. They have been jamming this down our throats since the beginning.

Think of every movie with a high school in it. The "popular" kids are shown to be the most shitty people imaginable and the nerds are the heroes. Anyone who had a good highschool experience know that those guys were cool and charismatic as fuck and the nerds were rapey beta creeps.

Guess what though media: your endless storylines haven't changed shit. The alphas are still successful and getting the girls, and the betas are still wondering why she won't give them a chance. All those billions wasted trying to push a lie..

good_guy_submitter • 1 points • 3 August, 2017 07:46 PM **[recovered]**

An alpha male is the guy who's banging this guy's make-believe girlfriend.

tallwheel • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 07:23 AM

You mean the girl who is letting him be her orbiter?

KingUmed • 12 points • 3 August, 2017 08:31 PM*

See, I was expecting the comment section to be flooded with feminists but I'm actually surprised it's full of beta cuck white knights with no balls actually saying words like "fragile masculinity". Man I knew men in general were f**ked but damn this is pretty sad. Hopefully in their lifetime they will learn that their paradigm is a complete lie taught to them by mommy, beta dads and the feminist agenda (yes all three of them respectively).

The propaganda is real and I'm STILL trying to wrap my head around how this media fueled emasculation of man would be beneficial to society. Because at the end of the day our biology doesn't lie.... All women are attracted to alpha males.

Idk why beta males are so convinced that an egalitarian society is literally the way to go, when that's not even what feminists truly want... it's total control that they want.

So... If they get the control, money, power, whatever they want by all the betas giving it to them and they STILL crave/need an Alpha (even though they won't admit) then what is the point of all of this?

[deleted] • 8 points • 3 August, 2017 09:09 PM

I like the theory that it's a collective unconscious shit test. A way to break the lesser men. It's a lot more pleasant than thinking it's the left wing parties trying to create future loyal voters.

neck-yourself • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 10:01 PM

"they" are experimenting on us like livestock. late 90's - present they have been experimenting by pumping up the "feminine force" via propaganda and by adding chemicals that affect human hormones into food and water. the testosterone rates have plummeted in recent years and its not a coincidence.

Kevo4ever • 9 points • 3 August, 2017 10:18 PM

It's funny because Adam Ruins Everything had a video on why marriage is bullshit and I liked it. But this video and the comments I saw earlier from a facebook post of it were pretty cuck-level-10000.

the_one_tony_stark • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 09:50 AM

From a political standpoint, the destruction of marriage is a powerful and destructive goal.

Marriage is among other things efficient division of labor and a way of getting people involved into investing in the future. It's the absolute best for children.

We've gotten to a point where it is legally fraught with risks to get married, so it can now be efficiently attacked by pointing out how bad a deal it is.

The same political activists (marxists/feminists) that made the deal untenable are the ones saying that marriage is bad for whatever reason.

No shit. You made it bad.

Docbear64 • 11 points • 3 August, 2017 08:47 PM

This is some $2+2=5$ shit and unfortunately I know a lot of men will happily gobble it up because It's comfortable . It's nice to think there is no male hierarchy , it's comforting to believe the reason you miss out on women , opportunities, and enjoyable social interactions has nothing to do with a deficiency with yourself .

So just keep eating shitty food, keep watching football players and Lebron James having their testosterone and adrenaline be a surrogate for a lack of a connection with your own body and sense of masculinity .

Just keep sitting on the couch and never realize the best being you can be because it'll make you , your friends, and everyone else around you feel better.

It's fucking sad man just like HAES shit so many people will just fuck themselves over for comfort and they don't even realize they're doing it .

Resangel • 10 points • 3 August, 2017 11:21 PM

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YTyQgwVvYyc> Here's the link.

It irks me that OP wouldn't post the link.

[deleted] • 82 points • 3 August, 2017 06:06 PM*

Well 1. I love Adam's ruins everything. 2. From their perspective..they're not wrong. Look at how they defined "alpha male" in the video. they define as obnoxious chach morons.

But in reality Adam right there is alpha. Well dressed dude, stylish, has charisma, displays confidence, displays intelligence. shows initiative. He even disagreed with the woman right there to her face and pulled her into his frame, has a successful youtube series that he writes, produces and performs in.

I also liked how they used a roleplaying game as an example how human interaction is always in flux. It's fuckin roleplaying. It's not reality.

Don't believe in the alpha/beta male dynamic? Join the military or even join a corporation. You'll find it really

fast. It may or may not have genetic influences but it certain has societal influences.

[deleted] • 30 points • 3 August, 2017 06:23 PM

This is the meta in the video. The alpha is in the guy playing beta, and the beta is the guy being irritating and aggressive in an attempt to be something he isn't.

Adam makes a point, and TRP has yet to put forward a reasonable rebuttal yet except to spew ad hominem on full blast, which is what most of you would call childish beta retaliation.

he makes a point, lets address the points or else modify our ideas. Not rocket science. The anger here means people are afraid he may have a bit of a point. Anger in debate is the tool for the loser when the argument looks lost as a hail mary attempt at a rescue, without substance.

[deleted] • 8 points • 3 August, 2017 11:50 PM

TRP has yet to put forward a reasonable rebuttal

um, you just made the rebuttal...

The alpha is in the guy playing beta, and the beta is the guy being irritating and aggressive in an attempt to be something he isn't.

i know it's scripted, but he's a celebrity holding frame bouncing a pushy aggro loser. the guy they present as alpha demonstrates no alpha traits other than aggression, and numerous beta traits (like inability to hold frame).

alphas absolutely exist in human and other primate social hierarchies. jordan peterson would wreck this kid. adam even mentions chimps here, and leaves off the fact that chimps ABSOLUTELY have alphas, but it's different from humans. female chimps do not have hypergamy, and will indiscriminately mate with any male that comes along. this makes it up to male dominance alone to determine which males pass their genes along.

in contrast, human alpha dynamics are more complicated because of hypergamy. females intentionally try to mate only with the top 10-20% of available men. those men are alphas.

and the joke about DND nerds doesn't change anything... a guy might be a loser in one social matrix and alpha in another. but in the societal matrix at large, the confident assertive guy with good fitness and a good job is top dog in most social matrices.

TRPmc117 • -3 points • 3 August, 2017 06:44 PM

Why is a reasonable rebuttal necessary? We all live this every day. Go walk around the supermarket. Look everyone you walk past in the eye. Tell me the alpha/beta dynamic isn't real.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 07:17 PM

It isn't. A person looking away from you doesn't mean that you're somehow higher on the social ladder than they are, or have any real influence over them.

Walk up to that same person who looked away, and tell them to leave the supermarket. They won't. That's what it means to live in an actual alpha/beta hierarchy - it's a dictatorship. My buddy is arguably more 'alpha' than me by mainstream definition, and even he can't tell me what to do and when to do it. Nor can he tell me who I can and can't fuck.

Humans don't operate on an A/B dynamic. A teacher has authority over you until you leave the classroom and school. An alpha has authority over you at all times. Even the Gov't has no authority over you when you leave their respective country.

[deleted] • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 07:22 PM

I'm thinking that a true alpha is one who has supreme authority over them selves.

If an entire department at work is treated like shit but one person decides to talk back and even walk out with no fucks given everyone thinks that person is gangster.

If someone decides they're going to be a boxer, comedian, business owner..etc and put the work in and crush all pre conceived notions that the person can't make it but does, people will think he/she is "alpha" or a "badass"

It's about taking command over your own life.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • -2 points • 3 August, 2017 07:30 PM

We're getting into subjectivity now, though. Objectively speaking, an alpha is pretty much a benevolent dictator.

Future_Alpha • 6 points • 3 August, 2017 07:30 PM

Walk up to that same person who looked away, and tell them to leave the supermarket. They won't.

That is because there is no direct power hierarchy between you and them. There has been no hierarchy established.

Now imagine you were some rich famous guy, say Elon Musk or Chris Brown. And you walked up to someone and told them to leave the store. They'd probably be confused, but they would.

An even better example is a cop. If a cop tells a person to leave the store, there is a CLEAR hierarchy evident between the person and the cop. The person unconsciously knows that the cop has more power AT THAT MOMENT, in that situation and so leaves.

That is why TRP says Alpha is contextual. Because it depends on the situation. This is true for chimps as well. If you take a chimp that is an 'alpha male' in his tribe and put him into a new tribe he will have no status until he earns it. He might become a beta male in the new tribe if the other chimps are much stronger than he is or he can rise to the top if he displaces the old leader.

Seriously, if you can't figure this out, I don't think you are ready for TRP.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 0 points • 3 August, 2017 07:34 PM*

Now imagine you were some rich famous guy, say Elon Musk or Chris Brown. And you walked up to someone and told them to leave the store. They'd probably be confused, but they would.

I beg to differ. I don't think anybody would leave the store unless the manager himself told them to leave and had his employees escort the person out.

A cop has jurisdiction. That power is given to them by the people and the gov't. The people can take that power away, whereas a true alpha cannot be overthrown by tribal protest.

I think you're confusing leadership and natural 'leader/follower' dynamics with alpha/beta. It would be retarded to say that there are no such things as positions of power in humanity, the only thing is that instead of being a clear leader/follower, there is a CHAIN OF COMMAND, which is completely situational and does not bleed into all aspects of life.

Seriously, if you can't figure this out, I don't think you are ready for TRP.

We're discussing true alpha/beta hierarchies, not TRP defined 'alpha/beta dynamics'. I've said many of times that there are alpha QUALITIES that people can possess, but that we don't live in a hierarchy that is purely alpha/beta. I've figured this out just fine; Piss off with your condescension.

ETA: An example of how we aren't living in an alpha/beta hierarchy is - mate guarding. Everyone on TRP frowns on mate guarding and calls it beta, when really it's a very alpha trait. And I don't care how much status you had among friends, you would NOT have friends for long if you tried to tell them to leave the bar when they were having a good time but you weren't or told them "no, you can't have sex with that broad because I like her".

Future_Alpha • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 07:55 PM

I beg to differ. I don't think anybody would leave the store unless the manager himself told them to leave and had his employees escort the person out.

Well clearly you don't know people that well. Also, why would people listen to the manager, according to your logic? That power is NOT given to them via 'given to them by the people and the gov't'.

WTF is a 'true alpha'? An Alpha in a human hunter-gatherer society can be easily overthrown if the people feel he leads poorly or if a challenger beats him. TRP concept of 'Alpha' is based upon this notion. Stop making up your own definition.

A cop has jurisdiction. That power is given to them by the people and the gov't. The people can take that power away, whereas a true alpha cannot be overthrown by tribal protest.

LOL if you think that ALL power is given to people 'by the people'. Democracy is a very recent notion. Most of human history, power was obtained and held through strength, and NOT through the people.

I think you're confusing leadership and natural 'leader/follower' dynamics with alpha/beta. It would be retarded to say that there are no such things as positions of power in humanity, the only thing is that instead of being a clear leader/follower, there is a CHAIN OF COMMAND, which is completely situational and does not bleed into all aspects of life.

Thanks for proving my point.

We're discussing true alpha/beta hierarchies, not TRP defined 'alpha/beta dynamics'. I've said many of times that there are alpha QUALITIES that people can possess, but that we don't live in a hierarchy that is purely alpha/beta.

This makes absolutely no sense. What qualities are you even talking about?

I've figured this out just fine; Piss off with your condescension.

If you did, we wouldn't be having this asinine conversation.

ETA: An example of how we aren't living in an alpha/beta hierarchy is - mate guarding. Everyone on TRP frowns on mate guarding and calls it beta, when really it's a very alpha trait.

According to whom? To you? There is a reason why mate guarding will cause a woman to

lose interest in her man. To her it shows that man she thought was 'alpha' actually feels threatened by another male. In tribal culture, only the males of low social standing (ie 'betas') mate guard because they are afraid of losing their woman.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 08:23 PM*

Well clearly you don't know people that well. Also, why would people listen to the manager, according to your logic? That power is NOT given to them via 'given to them by the people and the gov't'.

Stop. You know exactly why the person who is in control of the building can kick people out. Worst case, the cops get called for trespassing.

WTF is a 'true alpha'? An Alpha in a human hunter-gatherer society can be easily overthrown if the people feel he leads poorly or if a challenger beats him. TRP concept of 'Alpha' is based upon this notion. Stop making up your own definition.

Yeah, which is why I said that humans don't have alpha/beta hierarchies. TRP definition of Alpha doesn't apply to real-world alphas in species that actually function like that. Not hard to grasp.

Thanks for proving my point.

There are no chains of command in an alpha/beta hierarchy. The Beta doesn't rule over lesser people than the alpha, whereas there are levels of management in all jobs that each have their own authority over each other.

This makes absolutely no sense. What qualities are you even talking about?

The ability for you and I to go out to a bar, me not have a good time while you are, and me telling you "we're leaving" without you asking why. The ability for you and I to be hanging out with girls and me tell you that you cannot have sex with any of them because I want them. That's what alphas do. Period.

If you did, we wouldn't be having this asinine conversation.

It's not asinine. Because you're so focused on your definition and can't see why it's not applicable in the slightest doesn't mean it's asinine.

According to whom? To you? There is a reason why mate guarding will cause a woman to lose interest in her man. To her it shows that man she thought was 'alpha' actually feels threatened by another male. In tribal culture, only the males of low social standing (ie 'betas') mate guard because they are afraid of losing their woman.

According to actual alphas in species that actually function in an alpha/beta dynamic. They all mate guard - You're so focused on the human element to prove that 'human alphas' don't do something that you can't even see that, by definition, human alphas don't even fucking exist. If humans see it as weakness, whereas clearly other species see it as strength since it's the leader doing it, then what does that tell you?

Future_Alpha • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 09:00 PM

Stop. You know exactly why the person who is in control of the building can kick people out. Worst case, the cops get called for trespassing.

Yes I just explained it.

Yeah, which is why I said that humans don't have alpha/beta hierarchies. TRP definition of Alpha doesn't apply to real-world alphas in species that actually function like that. Not hard to grasp.

Yes TRP definition does apply. I dunno where you are getting the notion that TRP information does not apply to the real world or that Alpha's are not infallible. In EVERY SINGLE SPECIES that has an alpha/beta hierarchy, the alpha can be overthrown by a new challenger. Jesus fucking christ, go read a book or something.

The ability for you and I to go out to a bar, me not have a good time while you are, and me telling you "we're leaving" without you asking why. The ability for you and I to be hanging out with girls and me tell you that you cannot have sex with any of them because I want them. That's what alphas do. Period.

How is this in any way relevant? You have an unfinished thought here and it again makes no sense.

Because you're so focused on your definition and can't see why it's not applicable in the slightest doesn't mean it's asinine.

Its not 'my' definition. It is the commonly accepted definition. You come here and start talking about a definition of alpha nobody subscribes to.

According to actual alphas in species that actually function in an alpha/beta dynamic.

Name a species that does this. So far its been 'actual species with this dynamic'. Yet you have not named a single species.

They all mate guard - You're so focused on the human element to prove that 'human alphas' don't do something that you can't even see that, by definition, human alphas don't even fucking exist. If humans see it as weakness, whereas clearly other species see it as strength since it's the leader doing it, then what does that tell you?

Again, name what species you are talking about. Humans are Great Apes, so the only behaviors that are in any way relevant are what Great Apes do in the wild. Not wolves. Not Antelope. Not buffalo.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 0 points • 3 August, 2017 09:19 PM

Yes TRP definition does apply. I dunno where you are getting the notion that TRP information does not apply to the real world or that Alpha's are not infallible. In EVERY SINGLE SPECIES that has an alpha/beta hierarchy, the alpha can be overthrown by a new challenger. Jesus fucking christ, go read a book or something.

You are arguing a point that I'm not even making. Chill out.

How is this in any way relevant? You have an unfinished thought here and it again makes no sense.

It's relevant because THAT'S WHAT ALPHAS IN ALL SPECIES DO. They mate guard, they have complete control over the tribe, they have access to all the resources, they must eat first, and they do this ALL THE TIME.

If you cannot do any of that, you are not an alpha. The fact that humans do not function in that regard = there are no such things as human alphas based on the definition of what alpha means to species governed by A/B hierarchy. If you're suggesting there is a separate definition for humans, and that human alphas are different from the rest of the animal kingdom, then any and all animal analogies mean fuck all and everyone who uses them are stupid.

Its not 'my' definition. It is the commonly accepted definition. You come here and start talking about a definition of alpha nobody subscribes to.

Cute semantics argument. You know what I mean, yet you're trying to find a way to argue just to argue. You know who does that in the animal kingdom? Betas ;).

Again, name what species you are talking about. Humans are Great Apes, so the only behaviors that are in any way relevant are what Great Apes do in the wild. Not wolves. Not Antelope. Not buffalo.

I've mentioned gorillas more times than people have made Harambe jokes. I've also said that wolves don't have alpha/beta dynamics, since the 'alpha' is typically the father and mother, and the 'betas' are typically their children.

ETA: To be fair, I didn't mention them in this chain. I thought I did; my mistake. Gorillas. Gorillas are the animal that functions the way I describe.

Scymnus • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 09:35 PM

Yeah, which is why I said that humans don't have alpha/beta hierarchies. TRP definition of Alpha doesn't apply to real-world alphas in species that actually function like that. Not hard to grasp.

Well you're not on a zoology subreddit, are you? You're getting hung up on a pre-existing definition and refuse to understand that we can create our own language and definitions if we damn well please. We're just making it easier to communicate so fuck off with your nitpicking. If you have nothing constructive to add go somewhere else to find an outlet for your autism.

Let me know if you're ever in Europe and we'll see how that bar experiment goes. Don't bring condoms.

vengefully_yours • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 08:07 PM

You obviously aren't one of us. People move out of my way, they apologize for being there, guys taller than me avoid eye contact and move around me. Trust me, it's very real. It's not how tall you are, how aggressive or rich, it's who you are. The way I walk and my body language displays who I am, and most acquiesce or try to amog and fail.

In the military my chain directly above me almost always fucked with me in petty bullshit gestures and behaviors. They were intimidated by me, and so they fucked with me. When I became an NCO and had equal rank betas working with me, they always bitched about me, trying to make me look bad. My subordinates loved working for me, because I was laid back, competent, shit got handled and everyone stayed safe, if they fucked up I pulled them aside and spoke quietly to them rather than screaming and yelling like the others. I never micromanaged anyone, they got their job to do and I worked alongside them and also watched everything. Colonels and Generals sent me all kinds of positive feedback, often asking specifically for me by name when they visited the base, and addressed me with my first name. That shit never happens to the betas, they gotta kiss ass to get that, I did it by being a competent leader.

Shit, I'm only barely in the top 20% and its daily life for me. You'll never know what it's like, that's ok, you're not less or worthless, just different.

TRPmc117 • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 10:38 PM

You completely missed the point but what you're saying is legitimate except for:

Even the Gov't has no authority over you when you leave their respective country.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:46 AM

What I mean by that is that once you leave the country, you are no longer bound to the specific rules and regulations of that country. Instead, you have to adjust to the new country's laws.

For instance: If you're a woman and you leave America to Yemen, you'd best wear a burka and be accompanied by a man at all times otherwise you're fucked.

Apart from you committing a crime and being extradited back, a country can't force you to do squat outside of it.

mallardcove[S] • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 06:58 PM

Since when is looking like a pretentious hipster wearing thick framed glasses being stylish and well dressed?

[deleted] • 21 points • 3 August, 2017 07:00 PM*

Since he decided it worked for him.

Bet you don't have shit to say about Chris Pine with thick glasses. <https://imgur.com/a/IVSwK>

Sounds like you just don't like the look and want everyone to dress like you. Which them dressing for your approval wouldn't be alpha then would it?

vengefully_yours • -3 points • 3 August, 2017 08:12 PM

So flannel and a manicured beard with 11" arms while wearing girls jeans and 50 year old glasses is considered "working for them" and fashionable?

To them it's a costume. They're followers, of a fad no less. Like the 60 year old soft hands banker who can't dead lift his own body weight buying a Harley, putting straight pipes on it and playing "sons of anarchy" on the weekends.

There's an old school word for that. Posers.

[deleted] • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 10:08 PM*

We're all wearing "costumes" my friend. If not then you must be a trend setter. Let's see pictures of your completely 100 % original ensemble.

Also sounds like you just described this guy. https://www.instagram.com/buon_buon/

Go ahead knock him down a few pegs about his manicured beard and tight jeans.

good_guy_submitter • 1 points • 4 August, 2017 01:04 AM [recovered]

Thay guy isn't a fat fuck like Adam. And granted I liked Adam's video on prison, drugs, and eyeglasses.

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:35 AM

You're right. The douche above me though was talking shit about the way Adam dresses. Now you're dumb ass it talking about body competition. lol

Full of ad hominem tards

good_guy_submitter • 1 points • 4 August, 2017 01:42 AM [recovered]

I'm not ad hominem. Adam is a fatass, that's a fact.

The problem with his material is that it's based on a false wolf study that doesn't apply to humans. "It'd be like me saying some women are dominant because hyenas have faux-penis." He also didn't get his facts about chimps and bonobos right.

Either way, he is a fat lard. Even if his appearance has nothing to it with him being right or not.

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:46 AM

It is a fallacy. Because you're calling him fat and therefore he holds no credibility. And wtf are you commenting on me for? I'm in agreement with you and his bullshit science on this if you actually read anything that I posted. lol

good_guy_submitter • 1 points • 4 August, 2017 02:14 AM [recovered]

You linked buon buon. Who is a false equivalence to Adam. But yeah we agree otherwise.

TheGillos • 0 points • 5 August, 2017 04:21 AM

He's a fat fat fucker. Obesity isn't a good look on anyone.

mallardcove[S] • -8 points • 3 August, 2017 10:48 PM

Ultra defensive there. I am guessing you are a thick black rimmed glasses wearing flannel scarf wearing hipster type.

neck-yourself • -3 points • 3 August, 2017 09:50 PM

Imao i agree with you. the fact you got downvoted is a good reminder that this place is crawling with beta simps who are faking alphaness.

mallardcove[S] • 0 points • 3 August, 2017 10:44 PM

Yep. Lots of skinny fat unkept beard fedora wearing Seth Rogen look alike black rimmed glasses wearing Bernie Sanders loving hipsters here.

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 04:25 PM*

Yep you got me. I shave my head to look like Seth Rogan....errr or Joe Rogan...Whatever Rogan you want me to be to fit into your ad hominen argument. And of course i voted for Bernie Sanders...because well you said so. Isn't the way leftists argue?

It's funny really that the "alpha" Adam wants to define in the video isn't Alpha...that shit isn't even beta....That's just an all around bitch poser and yet you're acting exactly like it to a T. Alphas don't have to tell others how alpha they are as is what you're doing.

Congratulations and showing everyone what a parody of yourself that you are and embarrassing the cause.

The only good you've done was to expose TRP to that shit show propaganda video. Everything else you've done in this thread is proven you are the caricature depicted in the video.

PercussiveScruf • 0 points • 3 August, 2017 08:59 PM

I agree with you except the role playing example. You dismiss it as not being reality, but that wasn't the point of the example. The example was that Adam's version of an alpha male felt uncomfortable in a scenario he knew nothing about. Sorta like not knowing much about a sport but still trying to hang with a group that does know it. Like, you know football inside out but absolutely nothing about basketball. In this example, Adam's alpha would have stumbled on rules/players/something along those lines.⁵

Tl;dr Adam's version of the alpha got flustered by something he didn't understand/know about.

keonkla • 8 points • 3 August, 2017 08:04 PM

That video was so Damn ridiculous. Lmao at all the women/feminists hamstering about how men who aren't Masculine are real "men". Yet the comments also have a few Women saying that they despise weakness in real men.

JackGetsIt • 8 points • 3 August, 2017 08:06 PM

Those trending lists are completely controlled by Youtube and driven by money, youtube promoting an image of itself, and political ideology of the company. They have nothing to do with views or subscriptions.

I think the corporate feminist position is pretty transparent. Keep tearing down men and try to crack them like a pinanta and all there money and power will flow out of them and rain down on women and 'victimized groups.' The reality is that men will hold on their freedom and assets even tighter as the attacks ramp up. Men refusing to marry is a prime example of this shift.

DevilMayCry • 8 points • 3 August, 2017 09:23 PM

This video is great. Betas will see this and and be relieved. Like OP said, thins the herd and all of us will have to work a little less to get to the top.

[deleted] • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 08:59 PM

If there are no alpha males how can alpha males be toxic like feminists claim?

we_kill_creativity • 12 points • 3 August, 2017 06:04 PM*

To the point where simply lifting, eating right, staying in shape, dressing well, having good posture and not having an awkward demeanor will put you into the Top 20% by default.

We're already there. Hell, general self-confidence is becoming a rare commodity. I just got a job and dropped the

fact that I lift during the interview, just because I wanted them to know that.

I live in rural Illinois and if you know anything about this state then you know it's getting Venezuela levels of stupid around here economically. What I'm saying is that obviously we're competing for jobs, not the other way around. I managed to get them to offer me an extra \$5,000/year before I accepted the offer. I mainly used techniques about "being alpha" that I learned here. So anyone that tells me "alpha males don't exist" can go fuck themselves. I do exist.

iamanenemy • -11 points • 3 August, 2017 06:31 PM

You aren't alpha. Not yet. Continue your path.

we_kill_creativity • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 06:46 PM

Because, of course, you'd know that about me.

Belmont_Trevor • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 07:10 PM

yeah don't worry about his definition, or mine either, only you know if you're succeeding or not for sure

tbrmd • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 08:28 PM

This is the agenda someone, I'm not sure who but I think it's the people running the world is pushing on us. This is all I see now. Everything is an ad, an ad that will subliminally control your mind and actions. Best thing to do is do you and be the man you would look up to.

MistahGustitues • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 07:02 PM

College humor is running it also. Jesus, it's terrible.

[deleted] • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 08:15 PM

Easier for us here at TRP to make it into the top 20%, yes, but why would we want to have a society of weak beta males who can't stand up for themselves, others, or to tyranny of the state?

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 06:33 AM

Because if you are alpha it gives you a bigger slice. More weak men means more spoils for those who are not weak.

Dont_StopBelievin • 6 points • 3 August, 2017 09:38 PM

Can't believe I gave this cuck a view. What a fucking disgusting waste of 5 minutes.

JustDoMeee • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 09:45 PM

Yup saw this today and my bullshit alarm were all going off, just by looking at the title I told myself I wasn't going to watch that bullshit but then gave in to curiosity and it was exactly what I thought it'd be. Ah man, really liked Adam as well.

Il128 • 1 points • 4 August, 2017 12:04 AM **[recovered]**

"There are no alpha males, cause, Dungeons and Dragons."

My response. "Read any women's relationship advice column and see what kind of man is actually desired, what kind of man is cried over."

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 0 points • 4 August, 2017 04:31 AM

Their point is that humans don't have alpha/beta hierarchies, not that there aren't men who are more dominant than others and that women don't gravitate towards confidence and dominance.

They're attacking the definition of alpha, since alpha/beta dynamic is actually very specific despite how people use it frivolously.

rjmk • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 06:49 AM

The video did nothing to actually debunk the "alpha male" personality. It just talked about wolves and monkeys, and ended up making a point that the typical alpha isn't the alpha in a dungeons and dragons beta nerd group..

scalyblue • 1 points • 4 August, 2017 07:41 AM **[recovered]**

A few points that I need to make.

I've watched the video, and like most of Adam Conover's stuff, it's funny if not flirting with the truth in some places. You'd think it was a comedy skit and not a documentary, oh, right.

What's also funny, the guy you're calling a loser has a #1 ranking video on YouTube, multiple voice acting roles, his own TV show, is banging a pretty funny 7/10, and has a very prolific comedy career, while you're "Working in the media" serving kids eat for \$1.99 Mondays and dueling over 2 dollar tips, so who's the alpha here?

And wow, I've seen some insecure fucks in my time, but honestly you think this guy looks like John Oliver? He looks nothing like John Oliver. Even if he did, who gives a fuck what he looks like? Does John Oliver sexually intimidate you so much that you need to draw comparisons to him when you criticize someone?

Furthermore, I wear glasses, so do half the people I know, and how insecure are you about your own appearance that a, how did you put it, glasses wearing John Oliver lookalike skinny fat loser on YouTube acted as a legitimate threat to your own sense of masculinity?

If you disagree with, call bullshit on, or otherwise hate the message of a video, then attack the fucking message of the video and the questionable citations of the video, don't attack a guy for being an overbearing, nerdy hipster when that is exactly the part he wrote for himself.

Adam's right in that Mech was full of shit about the alpha wolves, and he's also right in that people who purposefully act like alpha wolves are basing their personalities on a lie. Red pill isn't about being an aggressive, dominant alpha wolf for the sake of being an alpha wolf, it's about being the best man that you can be and being intelligent enough to recognize the fact that men and women are not going to react to, or share viewpoints and priorities on sexual strategy and social situations, and if your priority is focused on being dominant for the sake of being dominant than that is really the antithesis of everything good that I've read on this sub.

TL:DR If a comedy video bruises your masculinity and is the herald of societal collapse, then maybe you're the one with the problem.

mallardcove[S] • -2 points • 4 August, 2017 11:53 AM

Spoken like someone who has never posted on this sub before. I work a 2nd job on the weekends to help pay off my student loans faster, fuck me right? This post reeks of concern trolling posted by someone who probably doesn't even lift.

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 07:04 PM

Man. I remember watching Hardly Working back in the day and actually enjoying it. CollegeHumor has been all downhill for a while.

colucci • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 07:11 PM

I'm calling it. The actor / producer of this show will (or already is) either a gay man, a cuck, marry an ugly woman, or if he manages to pull a good looking wife, she'll end up divorcing him.

AverageGuy16 • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 07:32 PM

I needed to read this and stop justifying my poor decisions FUCKING aye going to go work out now and stop being a lazy fuck, I will not be walked over god damn it

caffeinum • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 08:04 PM

I have watched his videos. Actually, others are good, but this one stands out with poor argumenting and weak points, even if you don't know about red pill, you will notice that. Guy is okay, he has just got wrong once.

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 10:04 PM

I actually remember seeing this video come up in my suggestions yesterday while I was browsing through YouTube but thanks to TRP I completely ignored the video because I know what it's about. I see the coordinated attacks I simply don't click that's all

Streik23 • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 10:07 PM

No, we do not exist. Nor should you talk about the Red pill club

[deleted] • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 10:07 PM

The censors have taken control of YouTube. Expect it to get much worse.

monkyking33 • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 11:11 PM

This video got shared by some SJW FB friends recently, the conversation descended into "toxic masculinity" etc... what this video really shows is that there is no such thing as an alpha wolf and they twist that logic to say that strong masculinity does not exist. The word Alpha has come to embody the strong desirable masculine traits and the men that it accurately describes. Regardless of where the term Alpha originated

isodomize • 1 points • 4 August, 2017 04:25 AM **[recovered]**

With Russia in the news about election fraud and this far left wing ideaoligy shit that is slowly ripping the west apart piece by piece I cant help but think Yuri Bezmenov(Ex-KGB agent) was right. North America is going to be weak as shit in the next 10-20 years and everyone is basically going to be strong armed into submission all through ideological subversion. If you haven't seen the interview its quite astounding how much he said to be true.

Link for anyone interested.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xFqShpJm_zc

SocietalEngineering • 3 points • 4 August, 2017 01:56 PM

It's a just a massive shit test tbh.

They are hoping that this sort of societal engineering will turn everyone but the most Alpha of the Alphas into betas.

Women try to turn men beta so they can find the ones that won't.

biggerbetterjobs • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 07:06 PM

You mean since TRP/PUA has become a mainstream thing large media outlets are trying to cash in on the alpha/beta dichotomy with videos like this to give some loser who doesn't want to put in effort hope and inspiration?

Media/entertainment in a nutshell. Create a youtube video and let some snowflake losers feel good and get you hits. ALPHA MALES DON'T EXIST! BODY POSITIVE! OMG IM SUCH AN INTROVERT! I HAVE SUCH BAD SOCIAL ANXIETY!

Just another case of vulture culture watering down thoughts and ideas to make a profit off hopeless losers.

[deleted] • 6 points • 3 August, 2017 06:08 PM*

The video made some good points and at times was interesting, but I think he misunderstands what is meant by the term alpha male. The term alpha male is used to refer to someone with certain traits that most women find desirable. He seems to think of an "alpha male" as a dumb jock that likes to work out, play sports, and fuck bitches.

At one point, he makes the argument that we shouldn't use the term because society is too complex. Someone who might be considered alpha in a night club might not be considered an alpha male in a D&D circle. While this is true, it does not disprove that there are traits that are considered "alpha."

Let's say that the jock character that Adam plays is exactly the same except he is an expert in D&D. Women in a D&D circle would be more likely to choose him over a D&D player who is physically and emotionally weak.

Alpha male is a concept, not a stereotype. It is a set of physical and character traits that women find desirable. For a minute, let's imagine a society where women found men that are physically weak and emotionally insecure to be more desirable than men who are physically strong and emotionally confident. The weak man would be the alpha male and the strong man would be considered the beta male. However, as evolutionary sociobiology would tell us, this arrangement is impossible. A society like this would become dominated by a society like ours.

jairohevaca • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 06:33 PM

I haven't watched the video, but I think your concept is quite wrong. You mixed the causes and consequences. Women desire the alpha because he is an alpha, not he is an alpha because women desire him. The alpha is essentially a sociable person, a leader and a person most people would trust on. The alpha has the ability to maintain his frame. The alpha is not defined by his skills or his physical. In a D&D circle an alpha might be a fat nerd guy, but he will be the leader of that group. Obviously, he must know D&D and be good at it. Women in D&D circles will find him attractive because his knowledge in D&D AND his alpha traits. In a night club women will find him attractive because his alpha traits, but they will prefer a man who has alpha traits and a good looking body(assuming looks is an important factor in that nightclub).

lolmonade • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 05:55 PM

Adam Ruins Everything is infotainment in its worst form, if you're looking to educate yourself. Blues actual facts and intermingles them with the host's personal opinions to guide viewers to outcomes he wants them to come to.

It's ok for entertainment value if you find his annoying persona mildly funny like me, but to base opinions on, if you want to be informed of anything besides humorously abridged history or studies.

sixseven89 • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 06:22 PM

Thankfully the comments have a decent amount of people who see right through it

[deleted] • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 09:36 PM

The kids bickering in this thread were worse than the video.

[deleted] • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 07:59 PM

Wonderful. Even more little bitchy backstabbers.

SILENTSAM69 • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:14 PM

Well I guess it is more of a way of acting than something you are born as. Seems like they want to pretend no one acts that ways though. lol

beltwaytr • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 05:12 AM

I watched a clip of it and I couldn't help but laugh. As soon as he brought up humans being closer to an animal with Matriarchy and showed the alpha version of a female I turned it off. He literally contradicted his own argument.

tio1w • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 12:45 PM

Searching for that video I found this one.

Goomich • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 04:23 PM

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-YsLl5Wb_7g

strikethrough123 • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 04:43 PM

You might be able to do away with the term "alpha male", but the qualities that encompass it will exist and will remain preferable. Confidence, assertiveness, and aggressiveness will always beat timidity, agreeableness, and submissiveness.

AsmellyFinger • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 08:23 PM

I will bust out laughing at the fist cuck to ever say "real men date single moms" to me.

iamanenemy • 6 points • 3 August, 2017 06:27 PM

skinny fat hipster glasses wearing loser

First, ditch the ego-driven emotional ranting. Ad hominem have no place in grown folk talk.

The weaker men get, the easier it will be for oppressive establishment operatives to trample our rights and walk all over us with more tyranny and freedom/liberty stripping actions.

You've already given all of that up, **and then some**. Surely you don't think that there will be any grand revolution anytime soon. That would be foolish to entertain. No matter how "alpha" men get. The video has some truth. Even TRP can't fully illustrate what entails being "alpha".

KnowBrainer • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 08:13 PM

"Take my civil liberties, I wasn't using them anyway"

neck-yourself • -1 points • 3 August, 2017 09:58 PM

come down off your high horse and go swing from a tree

pentakiller19 • 9 points • 3 August, 2017 05:05 PM

I think the video is bad but it raises some valid points. Instead of just bashing it, I would like to hear some

legitimate criticism.

MisterOrion • 37 points • 3 August, 2017 05:49 PM

How about, for starters, the Alpha Male portrayal is a fat guy with a terrible haircut and a whiny voice, positing that alpha males are just aggressive, impulsive jackasses?

biggerbetterjobs • 4 points • 3 August, 2017 07:18 PM

SERIOUSLY. What do they think Drew Carey is an alpha male too?

[deleted] • 14 points • 3 August, 2017 05:51 PM

but it raises some valid points

Oh you think so? How about you start, and then we will all tell you why you are wrong.

ModernEconomist • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 07:16 PM

Lets just stick with the science he referenced in the video. Its accepted in anthropology and primatology that agents that are agreeable and socially kind are most successful in social groups.

Adam is not wrong when he points out that in humans, its those who are most pro social that end up the happiest

vengefully_yours • 0 points • 3 August, 2017 08:17 PM

Oh really? I'm happy as fuck, every day is better than the last one, I'm about as anti-social as you can get and still talk to people. Followers are happy to be followers, that's no mystery. Leaders forced to follow will be miserable, particularly when the leadership is incompetent and inept.

Really, it's fucking raining and cold here and outs the best day of my life to date! Why? Because it's today and it's all mine. No worries kid, you'll probably never get it if you think that mangina on tv/YouTube is an alpha male.

NickA97 • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 09:45 PM

If you are so anti-social, what are you doing here?

Im_Not_Kevin • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 10:20 PM

Posting a comment online isn't really perceived as being AS social as going outside and spending time with people face to face; at least where I live that's how it's viewed. So I don't think your jab at him is really gonna work

NickA97 • 0 points • 4 August, 2017 09:38 PM

It's not a jab, it's a legitimate question. Sure, going out and being with people can be considered as a a more social activity than posting online comments, but being social is interacting with people, whether it's online or face to face.

He said he's as anti-social as you can get, and I'm just contesting his claim.

Casanova-Quinn • 7 points • 3 August, 2017 07:54 PM

1. In the video they place Alpha Adam into a group of nerds playing board games, showing that he's not the alpha anymore. But this contradicts the overall premise that there are no alpha males. The alpha male has only changed based on the situation, not ceased to exist.

2. The wolf study, regardless of its findings, is irrelevant. We're not wolves, and we're not that similar to them.
3. Adam falsely states the Bonobos are more closely related to us than Chimps. Even the source he cites literally does not say that:

"The bonobo is a sister species to the more widespread common chimpanzee, *Pan troglodytes*, and the two share equal footing as our nearest primate kin." —NYT

Future_Alpha • 3 points • 3 August, 2017 08:03 PM

"The bonobo is a sister species to the more widespread common chimpanzee, *Pan troglodytes*, and the two share equal footing as our nearest primate kin."

That is because Bonobos are a subspecies of the common chimp that separated from Chimps AFTER *Homo sapiens* ancestors separated.

rockstarsheep • 9 points • 3 August, 2017 05:54 PM

I think you're going to be hard pressed in the legitimate criticism department. I think that a well researched, reasoned and argued critique would be useful.

There seems to be a developing tendency towards disregarding anything that doesn't work with TRP zeitgeist, which is itself split into camps. Consensus seems to be difficult to achieve unless things are expressed black and white; and life is certainly anything but that.

One thing which I'll point out, which to me is glaringly obvious, is that as a species, we're probably the only one that looks at other animals and deliberately seek to infer and justify our behaviour based off of other species. Yes, there can be similarities, but more than often, it is the nuances that create the most marked differences between species. Like us, everything is a work in progress.

Future_Alpha • 14 points • 3 August, 2017 06:52 PM*

Easy.

1. Let's start with wolves. Wolves do have a pack hierarchy with a single wolf being the strongest one who sets the tone for the rest of the pack. They are the 'alpha male'. There are also wolves who 'help' the alpha male, who get second pick of everything. But during mating season, they pack kind of breaks up to go breeding, with the most dominant male getting his choice of the females. Like usual, the feminists take legitimate facts and lie about them.
2. Bonobos are not our closest genetic relatives. It is actually chimps. The guy in the video is full of shit. Bonobo's are a separate species of chimpanzee that formed AFTER *homo sapiens* separated from chimps. Although, Bonobo's have many behavioral similarities to Humans, so do all the other Great Apes including Chimps.
<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-closely-related-are-h/>
3. Human social structure is very similar to that of the common Chimp (ie NOT bonobo). This is evidenced by observing modern Hunter gatherer societies as well as through archaeological evidence and study of human civilizations across time. Humans, like chimps, have had a dominant male figure with a few allies that define the power structure with everyone else below. And just like in Chimps, human power structure was not always based on merely raw strength but on cunning as well. Finally, just like in chimps, the males at the top have the most mates while those

at the bottom have little/no access to mates, unless they usurp the position of the alpha either through cunning or strength or both. This hierarchy (with a few males at the top with all access to females) is evident even genetically - most men are related to fewer men than women (there is greater variation in mitochondrial DNA/x-chromosomes than there is variation in Y chromosomes between men). The video never covers this. Edit 2: I also wanted to add - if people were descended from chimps, humans would have a similar level of variation between X and Y-chromosomes. Yet they do not. Instead their genetic distribution is similar to the one I mentioned previously.

4. Hierarchies have been historically constructed with some men setting up a perimeter and protecting it as well as acquiring food through hunting (thus achieving the highest status as this is the most dangerous job). Other males who cannot (or will not) do this job were accorded lower status but were allowed to stay in the tribe provided they were able to be useful (by making pottery for example). If you want to know more, read Jack Donovan's 'The Way of Men'.

EDIT: In other words the video is full of shit.

rockstarsheep • 1 point • 17 August, 2017 04:26 PM

Apologies for my late response. Thank you for taking the time to provide some feedback. Much appreciated.

I must admit, I have a very hard time looking at how we as humans extrapolate information / knowledge from the animal kingdom and then either neatly overlay it on to human beings. It seems to me to be a false equivalence that doesn't hold a great deal of water. Whilst there may be similarities, when I consider the immense sophistication of humanity, and then contrast it to other species, we're so very different from all the other species on our planet. Even our "close" cousins, the chimps and bonobos. To me, I think that this is just too simplistic and maybe that's because we're still very much learning about ourselves and other species. It's a process that will take time to uncover more about our similarities and differences.

Now, I am not going to dispute power hierarchies here. I think that they are pretty self evident and indisputable. I will challenge the overlays and comparisons, because as I state above, we're in a different league to other creatures on this planet. We literally, run the show. Of the 6 or 7 million species on this planet, that should be in itself, quite remarkable, if not, exceptional. That doesn't mean I don't and others shouldn't appreciate all the other species. We're just super different.

Once again, thanks for taking the time to respond.

Future_Alpha • 1 point • 17 August, 2017 05:54 PM

when I consider the immense sophistication of humanity, and then contrast it to other species, we're so very different from all the other species on our plane

Studying psychology and medicine, I can tell you that the notion of human sophistication is a myth. It is a human delusion of grandeur - a desire to be unique, to be above the rest of the universe. This is the continuation of the 'snowflake mentality' that TRP talks about and on a larger scale was manifested in the belief that the Earth was the center of the Universe.

tate above, we're in a different league to other creatures on this planet.

Are we? How so? Just because we have language? Monkey's and Ape's have language. It has been partially decoded too, it is quite complex. Apes (like chimps and gorilla's) can learn

American sign language and use it to express their thoughts/feelings (indicating they can actually think, feel and have self awareness). Wolves also have a primitive language that they use to coordinate attacks on targets (which wolf comes from the front, behind, etc) - it is also a dynamic language where the sounds change based on the situation.

Because we can think? Most people's behavior patterns are linear and predictable. If one studies people for enough time, human behavior can be quite accurately predicted (just like other animals in the animal kingdom) and is the basis for marketing, propaganda and psychiatry. Animals can also think and come up with solutions to problems - crows can count to thirty and have figured out they can break the shells of hard nuts by throwing them under moving cars. Apes have demonstrated an aptitude for basic math as have other animal species.

We literally, run the show.

Sure we do. Dinosaurs used to run the show before, did that make them exceptional? They were not the only species at the planet at that time.

Humans are just like any other animal - lions are given sharp claws and teeth and camoflounge making them well adapted to hunting in the savannah, monkeys are given tails and thumbs to be able to efficiently climb from branch to branch to obtain food, humans got a big frontal cortex and opposable thumbs (neither of these are sufficient on their own - whales have brains of a similar density to humans but no opposable thumbs and racoons have opposable thumbs but not the same density of a brain as humans, hell the brain/body ratio of a dolphin is very similar to that of a human) to obtain food. A big frontal cortex and opposable thumbs (and some claim upright walking) was our adaptation to survive in this world. It turned out that it was the best for adaptation to most environments.

Here is the catch: the rule of Homo Sapiens Sapiens is tenuous at best. A natural catastrophe, disease, famine, drought can easily destroy us - animals are far more resistant to this than we are due to how long it takes us to birth and raise children to a level where they can sustain themselves. That is part of the reason why humans developed civilization.

Of the 6 or 7 million species on this planet, that should be in itself, quite remarkable, if not, exceptional.

I hope I have shown you that humans are not exceptional - just lucky.

rockstarsheep • 1 point • 17 August, 2017 06:43 PM

Fair enough. How did we manage to let's say, transplant hearts, eradicate some diseases, invent computers, harness the power of electricity? Even, have the capacity to compare and contrast ourselves with and amongst other creatures? And how about, compose music, learn about perspective, metallurgy, develop art?

What's your answer to that?

Future_Alpha • 2 points • 17 August, 2017 07:30 PM

How did we manage to let's say, transplant hearts, eradicate some diseases, invent computers, harness the power of electricity? Even, have the capacity to compare and contrast ourselves with and amongst other creatures? And how about, compose music, learn about perspective, metallurgy, develop art?

It is merely a utilization of the tools humans evolutionarily recieved - namely the frontal

cortex and opposable thumbs.

A well developed frontal cortex developed to allow primitive humans (Cro-Magnons) to develop primitive tools (like sharpened sticks and rocks), communication (when in a hunt) in an effort to obtain food in the African Savannah with few places to hide and climb trees. As these tools proliferated and improved humans continued to use their tools (frontal cortex and opposable thumbs) to improve these tools to make obtaining food much easier. Once humans realized that growing plants made for an even easier method of obtaining food, they became sedentary and the process of improving tool making began to increase exponentially.

Like I said, it just so happens that having a dense well-developed frontal cortex and opposable thumbs (and some would say physical weakness and bipedalism) is the best adaptation an animal can have to obtain food.

Humans like any other animals, are concerned with three things: obtaining food, obtaining water and fucking. Everything else is a byproduct of that. The method that humans go about it is dependent on their evolutionary adaptations (just like in any other animal).

rockstarsheep • 1 point • 17 August, 2017 07:55 PM

You raise some fair enough points, which are reasonable on their own. I don't think that they are by any small stretch of the imagination definitive, but definitely interesting.

To wholesale go down the road of ... "It is merely a utilization of the tools humans evolutionarily recieved - namely the frontal cortex and opposable thumbs." is in itself an oversimplification. In a way, Newtonian. I would think that in an age of Quantum Physics, we'd have a slightly more advanced opinion. Perhaps there isn't the data for that just yet, so the Newtonian model of the human being remains the dominant paradigm.

Once again, 1 species out of 6-7 million. One has achieved what we have as a species. We've improved our lot by a huge margin and managed to thrive and evolve. We have mastered quite a bit of our environment, but we are certainly not gods. Not by any small stretch of the imagination.

It makes me wonder what selected our species to evolve? Blind luck of the draw? We were going in that direction already? {I'm just spitballing here.}

Yes, we certainly have some prime drives... self-preservation and procreation. We're a herd species, so we rely on each other for both of these. That means that certain dynamics are going to develop and change over time, predominantly when access to the first component - self-preservation - changes; either for the better or the worse. We can survive on a heck of a lot less than what we live on now.

Now I'm not suggesting for a minute that our physical evolution is not important. It's the foundation of everything else. What I am suggesting is that our higher functioning brains might have given rise to an unexpected set of side-effects, which set us apart from our other fellow creatures. Maybe that's the capacity of transcendence and self-reflection that stems from that. If we were so hard wired for X, Y & Z, actually we'd not really be able to share our thoughts today.

And as a thanks; I've seen some discussions here turn in to a bloodbath of insults, I just want to thank you for this discourse. I'm enjoying it. You're giving me something to

mull over. Top stuff.

Future_Alpha • 2 points • 17 August, 2017 08:16 PM

s in itself an oversimplification. In a way, Newtonian. I would think that in an age of Quantum Physics, we'd have a slightly more advanced opinion. Perhaps there isn't the data for that just yet, so the Newtonian model of the human being remains the dominant paradigm.

I wouldn't say its Newtonian. I think what we speak of here is Quantum Physics. Why would I say that you ask? Because by analyzing humans and their actions in the way we do - we break down human thoughts and actions into their smallest components, they very basics of what makes humans operate the way they do. This is true of Quantum Physics. It breaks down particles and physics into its most basic components - it is impossible to go any smaller. Newtonian Physics is on a macro level - it is the study of movement and objects on a large scale. For humans this would be the study of population dynamics.

But yes, I agree. There is not enough 'official' scientific data to back up many observations one can make of humans in the wild. I hope we get there some day.

Once again, 1 species out of 6-7 million. One has achieved what we have as a species. We've improved our lot by a huge margin and managed to thrive and evolve. We have mastered quite a bit of our environment, but we are certainly not gods. Not by any small stretch of the imagination.

Achievements are a very human concept. Has a lion 'achieved' something by using its tools (claws, camoflouge, sharp teeth and fast running speed) when catching an antelope in the Savannah? Has an eagle 'achieved' something by using its wings to fly through difficult environmental conditions? I wouldn't say humans have achieved anything, they just used the tools that evolution has given us leading us here.

It makes me wonder what selected our species to evolve? Blind luck of the draw? We were going in that direction already? {I'm just spitballing here.}

Anthropology points to a number of things causing our species to evolve in the direction we did. Some of these things included the changing climate of the Earth and the loss of forests that forced our ancestors to spend more time on land (rather than in trees) where it was more dangerous, leading to the evolution of a herd instinct (safety in numbers), development of more advanced levels of communication (so that large numbers of animals can coordinate together to obtain food/hunt), which led to a larger frontal cortex leading to tool development and to more growth in the frontal cortex (over millions of years) leading us to where we are now. Moreover, we developed bipedalism because it was easier to cross large tracts of open lands on foot, it was easier to see predators and prey when standing on two legs and it allowed women to develop larger hips to birth children with larger heads (it seems like human females have developed the widest hip ratios possible to still allow for bipedalism and the birth of large heads - it seems that if humans where to develop larger heads that would lead to a change in the method humans walk).

Homo sapiens (and our ancestors) have been as much subject to evolution and natural selection as have any other animals. It's just that physical weakness and changing environmental conditions have led us in a different direction than other animals.

So yes, I'd say it's the luck of the draw that led us here.

That means that certain dynamics are going to develop and change over time, predominantly when access to the first component - self-preservation - changes; either for the better or the worse. We can survive on a heck of a lot less than what we live on now.

The instinct for self-preservation is present in all modern humans. It just expresses itself differently than it did before. Now instead of physical confrontations with man or the environment, it is now verbal and subtle. Instead of killing a goat to harvest its meat, humans now go to work to make money to be able to buy food and water and instead of building a mud hut or a tree house, people work to buy a house someone else built. The underlying principle remains the same - its clothing changes. We can easily return to a more primitive state of being, if some environmental apocalypse happens.

What I am suggesting is that our higher functioning brains might have given rise to an unexpected set of side-effects, which set us apart from our other fellow creatures.

I wouldn't say they are unexpected side effects but logical continuation of our capabilities as a species. Just like other animals use their adaptations to maximal effect so do humans, it just takes humans much longer to use their adaptations to max effect.

And as a thanks; I've seen some discussions here turn in to a bloodbath of insults, I just want to thank you for this discourse. I'm enjoying it. You're giving me something to mull over. Top stuff.

Thanks! Me too, I am fascinated by early human history. By imagining our ancestors struggling against each other and animals and the brutal environment that they were ill prepared for. By seeing a God in the fire. That magic is lost, sometimes I yearn for it.

rockstarsheep • 1 point • 17 August, 2017 08:32 PM

I'll need to have a proper think about your feedback and insights. Very intriguing and stimulating. :)

As an aside. A good friend of mine is a geneticist and he puts everything down to evolution. He and I have some rather interesting discussions, similar to what we have been having here. I always concede that maybe I am a little more open towards a slightly heretical way of thinking, but I always consider reason and the scientific method as having the final say. To ask questions, is a very human thing to do. Perhaps other creatures do as well. I don't know. Perhaps we're the ones having the basic interactions and dolphins are discussing some next level shit that would blow us away. {I'd like to think that sometimes, considering

some of the dumb shit that people do actually do.}

Anyway, I'll be back! Have a great day and thanks again.

mystery11 • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 08:48 PM

I think you may want to double check your facts on bonobos

<http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2012/06/bonobos-join-chimps-closest-human-relatives>

Future_Alpha • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 08:53 PM

I read the full article. What specifically am I mistaken in?

mystery11 • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 08:59 PM

Bonobos are not our closest relatives

Bonobos and chimpanzees are BOTH our closest relatives. Your statement is misleading.

Future_Alpha • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 09:02 PM

Yes. Because they are both chimps. Not really new news. But despite this, I was saying that we are, *technically* closer to chimps than bonobos because humans diverged from chimps 4 million years ago, whereas bonobos diverged from chimps 1 million years ago (more recently) (according to your article). This is in direct contrast to what the video said.

mystery11 • 0 points • 3 August, 2017 10:53 PM

No. You're not understanding this correctly. We're not "technically" closer to one or the other. Bonobos and chimps have a common ancestor that we are closely related to. We have some genetic traits common with bonobos and not chimps, and vice versa. By your logic you could also say chimps diverged from bonobos and claim that technically we're closer to bonobos. But we're not, it's an equal match to both.

Future_Alpha • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 10:55 PM

Purely from the perspective of genetic pedigree, we originated from chimps (its in your article) where people diverged from chimps 4 million years ago and bonobos diverged 1 million years ago.

But I get what you are saying.

mystery11 • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 10:59 PM

Yes but chimps at the time were not the modern day chimp. It was the common ancestor of modern day chimps as well as bonobos. Which is why you can't claim we're closer to one versus the other.

iamanenemy • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 06:29 PM

Rationalist thought that goes against the status quo? *Here?* Why don't you ask for all the gold in the world while you're at it?

sand141 • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:51 PM

The only this video gets right is that alphas can be contextually as shown by the board game scene.

Strong, masculine men are the #1 enemy to the global establishment.

The Empire Strikes Back

If you are paying attention these days Trump is under full scale attack by the Globalist Tyranny and he isn't doing so well. They took "Fake News" (the Putin narrative) and forced a law through Congress with nearly 100% voting for sanctions on Russia. Trump had no choice but sign it or look pathetic by receiving an overturned veto so early on for him. Trump lost big time. (he was pissed off too) Russia seems aware that the problem isn't Trump, it's actually the Globalist Tyranny, but they are upset he is so weak and incapable of doing anything.

What does this mean?

It means the gloves are off and the Globalist Tyranny now wants to end the Red Pill and it's many expressions of masculinity across the political spectrum. They might assassinate Trump if needed, but it looks like a quarantine situation is the goal for the moment.

Expect this mind war to get much worse and don't rule out more real wars as well as globalist police state like crackdowns.

Censorship is coming.

We all know the Red Pill might be taken down at any time. (known it for years)

Frankly it's surprising they let it go this far... we got ***too popular*** so it's time for them to attack males who aren't part of the Globalist Tyranny which is 99.9% of men. (and the Red Pill is maybe only a quarter or less of those men)

neck-yourself • 6 points • 3 August, 2017 10:03 PM

lmao dude you larp way too hard. /pol/ is way edgier than here and if "they" shut this place down 4chan will go to war.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:53 AM

It's very serious.

<https://youtu.be/RqITz8H1QaQ>

No joke... that's for sure.

BlodenGhast • 5 points • 3 August, 2017 08:09 PM*

The goal is not to weaken men. The video literally mentions that dominance is different in different scenarios. Also, If you have such a fragile ego that you have to go on a rant over a video that hurt your *fewwing* to feel

validated, then you're not an alpha male under any definition of the term, real or otherwise.

Also also, Adam Conover is the farthest thing from a John Oliver lookalike I can imagine, apart from the fact that he has glasses and wears a suit.

neck-yourself • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 09:39 PM

every single episode of his TV show has subtle left-wing propaganda. every. single. one.

godlesspinko • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 06:56 AM

Both viewpoints are complete generalities.

People adapt to the situations they find themselves in, and some approaches work better than others. Both "masculine" and "feminine" virtues are necessary, and help us adapt to different situations.

There are billions of people in this world, and aside from basic survival, they all have different ideas of what success means, and who they want to be. A strong empowered man can be a great protector, or a vain power-grabbing villain. A effeminate and emotional man may not be a fighter, but he may be a crucial player in a large supportive community that gets a lot of things done.

It's all relative, and we need not divide the world into A and B when we have every letter in the alphabet in every language in the world to chose from.

UbiquitousProphet • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 08:48 PM

Some men just want to watch the world burn. Enjoy the show boys, they aren't worth saving.

Rollo_Mayhem3 • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 08:54 PM

I've been applying RPT to my life for the last 4 weeks. Yesterday, I ask a chick, who proceeds to tell me something yadda, yadda, I have to get away from my crazy ex boyfriends, why she does not have a boyfriend and she SAYS, because I need an 'alpha male' type to keep me in line and these guys are all just crazy, blah, blah,

StrangelySensual • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 09:34 PM

Why you tryna get into men fam?

NotoriousTRP • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 10:00 PM

I feel like videos like that are just bad attempts to be funny. Obviously it was poorly done but in the past CollegeHumor had some hilarious shit (check out learning guitar to get laid, thats a classic) but this has no political agenda

deephurting666 • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:05 PM

Anyone got the link? I need a good laugh!

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:32 PM

Ask Tom Br*dy if Alpha Males are a thing.

wendysNO1wcheese • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:55 PM

Didn't know so many people listened to shitty hipster rap. This thread gets weird. Turns into a "who can name the most rap groups" thread.

biano_ • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:58 PM

This video is also morale dishonest, why was this video even made, who was there demographic when they made this, and what were they trying to tell them. They were basically trying to tell men who were trying to better there lives to stop being masculine.

biano_ • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:59 PM

Came to the realisation they just wanted subs from betas

johnnygun- • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:42 AM

Anyone who lets "the establishment" or videos like this make them into a lesser man was never intended to be a true man anyway. Fuck them let them do what they want to do I'm lifting every day cardio'ing the shit out of 100° heat and making 6 figures in the oilfield. Fuck the pussies.

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:55 AM

Ah yes, be agreeable not aggressive that totally makes their vaginas ache

Punchppplay • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:03 AM

Youtube, which is part of the emasculation of men, made the video #1 on trending ... what are the odds?

hyugafan • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:19 AM

In other news, the earth is flat and North Korea is a benevolent democracy.

mrbitanderson • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:33 AM

Lol Youtube has a case of wall to wall stupid at times

IncomingTrump270 • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 02:10 AM

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dad_bod

The phrase has been adopted in United States culture *as a celebration of this particular type of physique*, with references generally skewing toward a positive and light-hearted tone. This *masculine body type* is a unique cross between muscular and slightly overweight physiques, and could be considered skinny-fat.

Celebration?!

Mix of muscular and overweight...and yet can be called skinny-fat.

Something doesn't match up here.

Amanda Hess, author of a highly viewed related article on the website Slate,[6][7] explains her opinion that women find dad bods attractive: "We don't want a guy that makes us feel insecure about our body. *We are insecure enough as it is. We don't need a perfectly sculpted guy standing next to us to make us feel worse.* No one wants to cuddle with a rock or Edward Cullen. The end.

So lazy slobbs of women want lazy slobbs in men...so they don't feel guilty about their lazy slobbiness...I am ok with this.

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 02:14 AM*

i like how anything better than a "dad bod" is considered perfectly sculpted because it makes HER feel insecure. lol

No women i met or know is concerned with dad bod. They consider it a sign of laziness.

Btw i like the picture they use for dad bod. That's not "skinny-fat" wow

kasper138 • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 02:35 AM

That was actually hilarious.

TheTonkatank • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 03:23 AM

"To the point where simply lifting, eating right, staying in shape, dressing well, having good posture and not having an awkward demeanor will put you into the Top 20% by default." it already is this way.

a_n_d_r_e_w • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 05:29 AM

Funny, I love ARE, even when he opposes my views. I respect it. But I think he was debunking it from a very safe zone. He was pointing out just your typical alpha male, which I can't blame him for. But there are other alpha males, like a man who has his shit together (makes bank, looking good, well mannered), that I don't think Adam wanted to debunk because, I mean, if you meet with a person who has everything and you get along with one another, wouldn't you not want anyone else? I don't mean that in a shallow way

Soberskipper • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:44 PM

The human race is literally de volving especially the white western Caucasian race. What's so fucked up is that all you have to do is pepper peoples brains with false information subliminally and everyone takes it as truth on face value. I was shitestested/be littled the other day for calling myself a red blooded male. My response is always the same, in the wild I'd survive you'd be fucked. "but we don't live in the wild!".

Me: "not yet!"

IVlaskerade • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 12:57 PM

Why were you so concerned by this that you felt the need to make a post about it?

CarnivOre93 • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:02 PM

I appreciate videos like this and hope they make many more. It's a form of social Darwinism.

remerbernoto • 1 point • 5 August, 2017 03:37 PM

You'll notice that they entirely ignore the well documented facts about women and Ovulatory Shift. They ignore that women prefer masculine, dominant men in their pre-ovulatory phase and feminized men in their luteal phase. This never gets mentioned, because it's too inconvenient. Neither do they want to confront the well-documented fact that Hypergamy creates masculine dominance hierarchies. Instead they focus on terminology without considering that the term Alpha is an abstraction of an idea. They do this because they already accept that men are ridiculous and follow it up by more self-defeating ridicule of men (themselves) in the hope that it will absolve women of their true sexual preferences, Hypergamy and maybe seem endearing to some woman, somewhere, because they've been taught that vulnerability in men is Game.

...

Damn... True

ThePantsThief • 1 point • 7 August, 2017 09:56 PM

I couldn't get through more than half of that video. Cringe

SamuraiPizzaCatz • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 07:04 PM*

ETA: To the people downvoting I have a serious question - are you stupid? The video the OP discussed is defining alpha in the literal sense, not using the term colloquially like on here. The video content is

relevant - your feelings are not.

They're right, though. Alphas outside of the definition of 'strong leader' don't exist in the human hierarchy (or in wolf hierarchy, which is funny when you see all the 'wolf pack' analogies on here). A true alpha is like a Gorilla - access to all resources, women, and responsibility.

No, that's not the same as human access. I mean if you were to chill with your friends, only YOU would be allowed to fuck the girls, only YOU would be allowed to eat first, and only YOU decided when everyone came and left.

Do that to people and they will tell you to fuck off.

[deleted] • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 06:40 AM

I think you are taking the term too literally. Human alphas are the top of the social order, not literal kings. An alpha male in human society still abides some social conventions to maintain his power. Humans don't rule by brute force alone.

SamuraiPizzaCatz • -1 points • 4 August, 2017 06:44 AM*

I'm taking the term to mean what it means when applied to every non-human species on the planet.

Again, if people want to throw the term around here to mean a person who is confident, assertive, dominant, and stress/anxiety free, then that's fine but the literal definition of alpha is not applicable to humans.

The point of the video the OP was talking about was saying that humans don't have literal alphas. If that's not what people mean when they're talking about alphas, then the OP's bitching about it is nothing but a hugbox at this point since they are not wrong that literal alphas don't exist in human society.

ETA: To the people downvoting I have a serious question - are you stupid? The video the OP linked is defining alpha in the literal sense, not using the term colloquially like on here. The video content is relevant - your feelings are not.

KenMicMarKey • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 10:01 PM

Damn, that fragile male ego. Adam better look out, he's triggering that alpha male ego!

[deleted] • 2 points • 3 August, 2017 10:28 PM

Sounds like OP got red pill'd :)

Deliciousbutter101 • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:22 PM

When he talks about "alpha males" it's very clear that he's not using the same definition as you. He's talking about stupid, brutish, and unsympathetic men. Sure you can try to argue with him using definition but you won't go far. First a lot of people use the term that way and second it's a slang term meaning it by definition, can't have a single definition. Stop getting mad at people for "using your word wrongly". It's not your word. You didn't make it up and even if you did you don't own it.

Besides talking about alphas wasn't the main point of the video, that was just there to get people's attention because it's a popular word nowadays. All he was trying to say is that being stupid or brutish, not caring about women and having no compassion, and primarily using physical appearance isn't a good way to get a meaningful relationship. If you disagree with that they I guess you're stupider than I thought.

wiseprogressivethink • 1 point • 3 August, 2017 11:48 PM

They're turning the friggin' frogs gay.

red_pill_account1 • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 01:15 AM

I saw a video the other day that talks about the opposite thing that I found very accurate. It defines being an alpha in today's society well and even talks about the downsides of being an alpha in today's society.

Let's give this video more attention instead:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WdQpLDm6c0w>

WhiteBeamz • 1 points • 3 August, 2017 08:48 PM [recovered]

"Betas are the Alphas of Love :^)"

[deleted] • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 06:36 AM

Betas are alphas of nothing.

Gustacho • 0 points • 3 August, 2017 09:55 PM

How was the video wrong about their hypothesis?

[deleted] • 0 points • 4 August, 2017 02:33 AM

This post is fucking hilarious.

Martel_732_Tours • 0 points • 5 August, 2017 04:20 PM

Anyone with any modicum of life experience will know instinctively that Alphas DO exist, no question about it. Most are born that way and not made; things that can't be faked; facial structure, height, skeletal build, base of athleticism, intelligence, testosterone levels, dick size are the predominant factors. If anyone says anything different either they are naive or wilfully ignorant.

ronso • 1 points • 4 August, 2017 02:10 AM [recovered]

Thanks guys for consistently providing top-notch cringe material. I can always go to this sub to show my friends how hilariously fragile masculinity is. This one is 10/10. Bravo! -another girl you'll never sleep with

mallardcove[S] • 1 point • 4 August, 2017 02:19 AM

Wouldnt want to sleep with your fat ass anyway

ronso • 2 points • 4 August, 2017 02:25 AM

Lmao whoa we've got a clever one. Can't argue with me because you can't use logic, so you resort to name calling like the man baby you are

ScroodgeMcDick • -1 points • 3 August, 2017 06:29 PM

You are so spot on sir. I'm intrigued, which media outlet do you work with?