

Female researcher gets Red-pilled while studying why 25% of men are now childless in Norway -- and it's steadily rising and mostly involuntary

May 8, 2018 | 983 upvotes | by [Reven311](#)

Fertility figures from Statistics Norway show that fewer and fewer men in Norway are fathering children.

The share of men who are childless at age 45 rose from 14 percent in 1985 to 23 percent in 2013.

The share of women who had not become mothers by age 45 increased from 10 percent in 1985 to 13 percent in 2013.

So to put this in perspective, women's childlessness has only risen by 30%, but men's childlessness has risen by a dramatic 64% in comparison (2 to 1). In raw percentage gains it's 3 to 1 (+9% vs +3%).

And apparently according to the researcher **most of it is involuntary**.

Men want to have children too

Why do so many men in Norway never have kids?

The development is paradoxical:

Norway is one of the countries in the Western World with the highest birth rates. More children are born per capita than nearly anywhere else.

Norway is also known to be a vanguard country with regard to equal rights for women and men.

“Both men and women in Norway answer in studies that having children is an important part of life. Few men or women consciously decide against having them. **The desire to have kids has not changed,**” says An-Magritt Jensen.

Norway is an interesting case, because it's basically like an egalitarian dream come true, the gold standard feminist model they want for America. But people (mainly men) are increasingly not able to meet their most basic desires in life.

Jensen, a sociology professor at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) in Trondheim, concludes that something else must have changed in Norwegian society.

She has conducted research on this issue for several years, especially through interviews with men.

“Expectations of Norwegian men have rocketed,” explains Jensen.

When women do give birth to children, it turns out that it can often be with men who have kids from previous relationships.

This is really important to recognize, and she should be commended for courageously stating the obvious.

“When Norwegian men from the working class have children, it is more often by chance,” explains Jensen.

She stresses that one often finds the most delighted and devoted fathers in this group.

So income seems to be a key driver of men's lower chances of reproducing in our modern egalitarian

world, but that's probably not the whole story.

What actually happens often is that men who are already fathers get recycled.

Nevertheless, she ascertains that feminism and equal opportunity ideology have had an **unequal impact on men** and women in Norway.

“In other Western countries too there are men who never become fathers. But the proportion is especially high in Norway.”

What this basically means is with near perfect egalitarianism about 25% of the male population is simply obsolete (at least in a biological sense), and that number may continue to rise for the foreseeable future. Men have always been the disposable gender, so this is just a reversion back to our roots prior to the advent of agriculture, which precipitated a desire/need to promote monogamy (partly through religion) to extract beta male productivity for economic/societal gains. But our modern world simply doesn't need the bottom 25% anymore. They're essentially a waste of space. Females have re-established a sexual dynamic via education and birth control that strongly favors their reproductive strategies again after centuries of repression.

http://sciencenordic.com/sites/default/files/imagecache/300x/Barnloshet-statistikk-2_None.ipadFull.jpg

<http://sciencenordic.com/quarter-norwegian-men-never-father-children>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

ApexmanRP • 434 points • 8 May, 2018 07:20 PM

"What actually happens often is that men who are already fathers get recycled."

Men who have fathered children have already proven that they are reproductively successful.

Its just another way for women to share the "best" men.

Hjalmbere • 292 points • 8 May, 2018 08:28 PM

In some cases these guys are your typical IDGAF losers. Case in point would be my cousin who fathered four different kids by two different women before he drank himself into an early grave. The welfare state has removed many of the negative consequences for both women and men who make poor reproductive choices.

Cheveyo • 81 points • 9 May, 2018 01:05 AM

I know someone who, at one point, had several women fighting for his affections. He's short, balding, and very self-absorbed. And yes, each of the women has had at least one of his kids.

I've honestly never understood it.

omega_dawg93 • 51 points • 9 May, 2018 02:39 AM

don't waste your time trying to understand it... women are weird when it comes to who they choose to spray inside them.

i know multiple losers, druggies and alcoholics who have kids in the double digits. once women hear of a guy putting down good dick and making kids, it's like they go "dumb" and line up to have the guy do them too.

can't explain it... can't understand it... and i doubt the women understand it themselves.

[deleted] • 36 points • 9 May, 2018 04:12 AM

i know a guy who wasnt a druggie or anything, but he, back in high school, learned how to act like a bad boy and had sex with a lot of girls. he started lifting and building a image, and they flocked to him to get his dick. that year, was also the year he had sex for the first time. while he didn't have kids, he was able to get all these girls. they got word that all the girls fucked him, they wanted to see why he was so great.

Coptek91 • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 09:48 AM **[recovered]**

Bingo! There was a short, skinny, perverted druggie that would repeatedly brag about how he banged hundreds of girls and sold powder and all this other degenerate shit. At first I thought he was lying about sleeping with that many women but for fucks sake, every other day he would have a cute little 7-8/10 girl around his arms.

Women don't want good guys. Notice the typical story a woman in an abusive relationship had. "Oh he was such a jerk, he was emotionally abusive, he would slap me and hit me. I finally broke up with him after 7 years of dating." Why the fuck would you date an abusive asshole for 7 years unless you liked it.

I don't even try to understand women anymore but they really are completely different creatures. Look up any average serial killer and they have HUNDREDS of love letters,

marriage proposals, and raunchy photos sent to them by hoardes of women. They really are from planet Venus. Sociopaths, assholes, and selfish narcissists would have been bred out of the gene pool a LONG TIME ago if woman didn't love to spread their legs for them so much.

memphisjohn • 16 points • 9 May, 2018 07:11 PM

Sociopaths, assholes, and selfish narcissists would have been bred out of the gene pool a LONG TIME ago if woman didn't love to spread their legs for them so much.

Go back to pre-civilization days... when you are living in anarchy, every day is a fight for survival against predators (human and non human)... you want your male mate to be the baddest of the bad.

Chaddeus_Rex • 3 points • 10 May, 2018 01:26 AM

perverted

I dunno why you use a word with negative connotations like "pervert".

Women LOVE perverts. The "dirtier" the better.

LukesLikelt • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 09:41 AM

He probably had a big dick or knew how to fuck

Imakesensealot • 8 points • 9 May, 2018 07:02 PM

There's nothing to be 'understood' about it. That's the core RP theory. I don't even know what some of you are doing on this sub? RP is a state of mind. The most attractive trait in any man of any kind is the ability to not give a fuck. When you we'll and truly deeply do not give a fuck, nothing, from insecurities to chicks thinking they're better than you gets you down. That's why these guys are successful. You sitting here on your high horse is exactly the opposite of what you're supposed to be doing.

Hoodwink • 44 points • 9 May, 2018 01:58 AM

I think two of the most important personality traits women look for in marriage partners when not properly socialized within 'patriarchy' is 'self-absorption' (or narcissism or the ability to be selfish with resources) and cluelessness (or the bluepill or easily controlled by women).

That's a bit messy, but the reason why I had have so many parenthesis is that the ideas crossover. Overall, the main characteristics show that the man will be selfish which increases resources of the man, and then the no-options/cluelessness/blue-pill means the women can squeeze resources out of the man.

Essentially, the reason he's the perfect candidate is because he's seen as the perfect mark. He's the guy that will fuck over his friends and family to pay back his debts or sell shitty crap to.

Coptek91 • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 09:37 AM **[recovered]**

EXACTLY THIS. Women always bitch about how there are no "good/nice men around," well sweetie, assholes and Narcissists would have been bred out of the gene pool if you didn't love fucking them so much.

Typical Female: "I had an abusive boyfriend/husband for 6 years that would beat me and abuse me and degrade me"

Me: Why did you stay with him for 6 years?

Typical Female: "Because I LOOOOOOOVE HIM!!!"

Women are the gatekeepers of reproduction. Selfishness, narcissism, and sociopathy would have been wiped out a long time ago if women would stop spreading their legs for them.

Soultrane9 • 13 points • 9 May, 2018 12:50 PM

When I did the exit interview after a 4 years LTR:

Me: You will tell the next guy you were used and abused right?

Her: Yes that's for sure!

Me: Will you share that you were asking for it and enjoyed every minute of it?

silence

ozaku7 • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 12:10 AM

Haha just reminded me. My gf used to be so distant and made me feel so replaceable by how she behaved. Then I fucked this other chick, told her and also said to go fuck herself. It's almost been a year and now she's saying she can't move on because she still loves me.

I also first broke up, she didn't care, still the same, but broke down completely and promised change and told me how much she loved me when I told her I found a replacement pussy.

luciagarcia8818 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:38 PM

"I think two of the most important personality traits women look for in marriage partners when not properly socialized within 'patriarchy' is 'self-absorption' (or narcissism or the ability to be selfish with resources) and cluelessness (or the bluepill or easily controlled by women)." - So someone who is only interested in themselves but is easily manipulated? This seems contradictory. I mean, narcissists have a big ego and therefore do not care about others so it is very difficult to control them because they have no incentive to take others opinions into account.

Hoodwink • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 02:46 PM

You'll be surprised how many people have these two qualities.

zephyrprime • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 09:38 PM

Geez if you guys read some PUA you would know that "social proof" aka "being popular" is inherently attractive to women.

Auvergnat • 12 points • 9 May, 2018 06:33 AM

You haven't fully understood TRP theory until you've understood the fact that (and why) women are looking to partner up with beta providers, instead of alpha stallions.

Avesatanie • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 09:49 AM

Care to explain why? The only think that comes in mind are post wall women.

Layback • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 11:26 AM

Betas are safer because they don't have the ability to get a girl like an alpha does.

Auvergnat • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 04:10 PM

Rollo's post "schedules of mating", or the post currently on TRP's front page "elucidating alpha and beta" are a good start.

AF;BB is TRP 101, but you need to spend time outside of this sub and on the rest of the manosphere to learn it now

Shaman6624 • 1 point • 13 May, 2018 03:35 PM

Because betas are more reliable as provider.

luciagarcia8818 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:40 PM

Women prefer betas, so betas gets partners easily... yet alphas are the one who get the most girls?

JohnnySixguns • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 01:47 PM **[recovered]**

Yes, post wall women. Don't read too much into it.

Women want Chad. Few Chads are proposing marriage at 25 though. Of those that do, they better have money or they instantly lose status.

Think about it: super hunky artist type dude definitely gives Stacey the tingles. They fuck all over his shitty apartment : art studio. She poses nude for him and he paints her purple and does all kinds of kinky shit.

Then he proposes marriage. But he's an artist. He's got no ability to provide. He's not alpha fucks anymore. He's not even a beta provider. He's a starving artist loser.

So when someone says women prefer betas, they are talking about as marriage material. Not as fuck partners.

luciagarcia8818 • -1 points • 9 May, 2018 02:48 PM

all over his shitty apartment / "art" studio. She poses nude for him and he paints her purple and does all kinds of kink

But that means betas have more success because women do not breed with alphas, since they are not marriage material. And that artist dude you described is simultaneously a beta and an alpha because he gets the girl but can't maintain her.

Auvergnat • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:11 PM

Women want an alpha for something, and want a beta for something else.

luciagarcia8818 • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 11:27 AM

So an alpha as the same amount of success at getting women that a beta does?

Auvergnat • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:07 PM

Depends what you mean by success. Women want an alpha for **sex**, and want a beta for **attention and support**. So alphas get the lion's share of the sex.

luciagarcia8818 • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 09:22 PM

Why would an alpha desire sex with someone that, when interested in them, only wants to have sex with them and has not interest in them beyond that? I mean some romps of that genre are nice but in the end you will just accumulate numbers.

ssr401 • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 01:20 PM

We've all seen cases like that. It disproves the claims of incels who complain that they'll never find a girlfriend just because they're short or have poor facial bone structure or whatever.

Cheveyo • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 05:36 PM

There are some people who are born with an unfortunate appearance, but most incels aren't like that. What they tend to lack is social. I think there are some that recognize this, but too many refuse to take responsibility for themselves.

ozaku7 • 3 points • 11 May, 2018 12:16 AM

Most losers use circumstances as excuses. They could do a ton to be more attractive but they rather wallow in self pity so they don't have to spend any effort into anything. Incels are creatures hoping that everything falls right onto their lap and it's good that these losers are filtered out of the gene pool.

AntixD • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 07:11 AM **[recovered]**

were any of them good looking women with any good qualities in them?

Cheveyo • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:14 PM

Average women, one below average. So only one was at his level.

All-DayErrDay • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 11:32 AM

Haha I dont know why you're surprised TRP proves that with enough self development that a short balding guy can have women attracted to him. Right theres proof in the alpha traits department.

Ferocious245 • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 11:46 AM

None of this matters, short, fat, balding. The principles of female attraction are simple: do you have big arms? (Even if youre fat this is better than being skinny, for men), do you not care what she thinks about you? are you socially respected? Is your social circle big and does it include other hot women? Do other women want to fuck you? Do you have social value?

gopher_glitz[] • 71 points • 9 May, 2018 12:39 AM

My half brother is a homeless, junkie, jobless, high school drop out and has fathered 4 kids from three different ham beasts.

SkaTSee • 67 points • 9 May, 2018 02:17 AM

hmm, i smell the beginning to idiocracy

ThomasHobbesROK • 13 points • 9 May, 2018 08:58 AM

Ham beasts? Well I suppose he deserves our sympathy rather than jealousy

zephyrprime • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 09:34 PM

Idiocracy is prophecy, not entertainment

TominatorXX • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 11:49 AM

LOL. Could you do a separate post on him? I want to hear more.

kronos415 • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 01:15 PM*

Making light/fun of men unaware of their stupidity does nothing to better our gender as a whole and deters other men that are blue pillled from potential enlightenment. Worsening our current status in society and potentially deters any legitimate arguments someone from this sub could make to revert current social stigmas. Please think before doing. In your haste to prove to others that you arent some beta by belittling other betas, you are proving that at the very least you are not an alpha.

ApexmanRP • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 09:07 AM

Yes i get that.. But clearly he had something that these women wanted...

JohnnySixguns • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 01:50 PM [recovered]

Ham beasts != desirable women

greeb666 • 38 points • 8 May, 2018 11:56 PM

People say best and forget that serial killers like Bundy had kids on death row. The green river killer gets tons of fan mail and so on. Women are attracted to a lot of things, best is not always one of them. There are plenty of worthless dudes with multiple baby mommas. I know quite a few.

joeyjoosharknado • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 12:21 AM [recovered]

They're more attracted to guys with alpha traits, even heavily distorted alpha traits, than beta men. From a purely instinctive female POV serial killers are exciting, dangerous, which still gives them the tingles more than a simpering loser soyboy.

greeb666 • 11 points • 9 May, 2018 12:26 AM

Oh I agree. Best is probably not a good word though.

ApexmanRP • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 08:59 AM

Yes, it depends how you define "best". In this case I was meaning proven fertile.

redpillbanana • 114 points • 8 May, 2018 11:00 PM

"What actually happens often is that men who are already fathers get recycled."

Recycled father = the most clinical euphemism I've ever heard for a Chad.

Auvergnat • 15 points • 9 May, 2018 06:35 AM

On the contrary, I'd say what's attractive about men being fathers is primarily that they have demonstrated they are prime beta material.

redpillbanana • 13 points • 9 May, 2018 08:50 AM

You're absolutely right when women are operating in a more traditional society where there are social consequences for sleeping around and having kids out of wedlock.

In Norway, where single motherhood is incentivized by the government, the women are not going to worry about how well the fathers can support or raise their children.

MrQinDang • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 12:10 PM [recovered]

And without fathers, the men become boys and the cycle repeats.
Norway is turning into Hell, god damn it. God bless them man.
Had Hitler have won, they'd not be breeding themselves out of existence.

lean_back • 2 points • 10 May, 2018 12:45 AM

Agree with the first two points but what do you mean breeding themselves out of existence?

lby1is3 • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 05:15 PM

Well that went from 0 to Nazism real quick

BunnyPoopCereal • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 07:05 AM

Probably the only way to know for sure is to look at these "recycled men" and see if they're actually Chads as far as looks are concerned.

1z1z2x2x3c3c4v4v • 8 points • 9 May, 2018 12:06 PM

as far as looks are concerned.

Its not about their looks, its about their **IDGAF attitude** combined with their assertive **take risks** personality.

Simply said, they approach and hit on everyone, and could care less if they get someone pregnant or get an STD.

If you acted like that, you could get all the girls you wanted too...

Stop thinking its about looks.

Its about attitude and assertiveness.

ozaku7 • 3 points • 11 May, 2018 12:18 AM

Finally someone talking sense. Women are just a numbers game. Hit on them and 1 out of 200 will definitely bite. 1 out of 10 of you are good, 1 out of 2 if you are a god.

Incels are incels because they can't talk to girls without fainting. Even if the girl would do all the work they would still not manage to get their dick wet.

1z1z2x2x3c3c4v4v • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 10:59 AM

Hit on them and 1 out of 200 will definitely bite.

The ratio is much better then that, in my experience, and noting the experience of others.

For example, my shy friend was looking to get back into the game after a breakup, and here are his stats:

60 days

38 girls approached (goal was approach 1 per day)

8 numbers (1 out of 5 did bite or 20%)

5 dates

1 hookup

Now he stopped after that one hookup, and they are still together, but I firmly believe he would have continued to get more dates and hookups, as **he simply got way more**

comfortable, confident and less caring about all the rejections...

Even according to Corey Wayne you will get 10-12% to date you and 3-5% to sleep with you, if you just act like a man.

Yes, its a numbers game, but the ratio is not that bad once you get into the flow of just approaching and not caring about the rejections, because you will get rejected... a lot.

Incels are incels... because they are just unwilling, or mentally unable, to do anything to help themselves. And our society today makes it easy for them to live in mommies basement forever.

Back in the hunter-gather days, these were the losers that didn't breed, were weak, and fell behind and got eaten by the tigers... Mother Nature weeded them out of the gene pool...

Even if the girl would do all the work they would still not manage to get their dick wet.

And that is the difference between an incel, or autistic guy, and just someone who is just shy, more feminine, and needs the girl to approach first.

The shy guy will act once the girl acts first, the true incel, will need to go home and cry.

Not everybody is guaranteed love, life, or prosperity. This is not some inalienable human right. As a man, you need to be able to fight for it, even just a little... else you just get eaten by the tigers of the Sahara plains...

ozaku7 • 1 point • 27 May, 2018 01:33 AM

Incels are incels... because they are just unwilling, or mentally unable, to do anything to help themselves. And our society today makes it easy for them to live in mommies basement forever.

Back in the hunter-gather days, these were the losers that didn't breed, were weak, and fell behind and got eaten by the tigers... Mother Nature weeded them out of the gene pool...

That's why they should not be helped and not procreate for the sake of our society.

luciagarcia8818 • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 12:41 PM

So being sucessful in passin your genes is a beta trait, not an alpha one?

Auvergnat • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 06:27 PM

I see your point. Every man can have kids so I don't think it's a trait either way. But being a father means you've been preselected by at least one woman (alpha? /u/redpillbanana 's argument), but assuming you didn't leave her it also means you've been selected as a providing, kids-raising husband (beta? my argument).

luciagarcia8818 • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 12:28 PM

That means you are an alpha and a beta at the same time? They are mutually exclusive categories.

Auvergnat • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:08 PM

Not if you talk about alpha or beat traits/behavior.. See the post "elucidating alpha and

beta" on the sub's front page.

luciagarcia8818 • 2 points • 11 May, 2018 09:37 PM

This article treats relationships like some calculation problem that needs a strategy to work.

The article defines sex appeal as alpha behaviour and that it is the most important part in attracting women since they have been hardwired by evolution to select physically fit mates.

"On the other hand, you have beta traits. Traits that indicate you'd make a good husband, father, provider." - This indicates that you are a good mate, but does not serve to attract mates. But if the evolutionary theory is correct this can't happen since it is also a factor in signalling ritual.

In the end, if you dial up, your alpha traits, you will fuck a ton of girls but it will be meaningless since they are one-offs. You are only chasing girls that already follow the behaviour you associate to women.

The article finishes by saying you have to control the beta traits, to dial down the will to be a father, supporter or partner. This is a recipe for a relationship end. No one wants to stay a long time with someone whose main trait is sexual attraction, and is only partially interested in helping in other issues.

ApexmanRP • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 09:03 AM

Ha! I don't think they even need to be chads, maybe just higher betas.

WolfgangBreitweit • 49 points • 8 May, 2018 11:10 PM

It's a sequential harem. The old model in a new interpretation. Old wine in new bottles.

Reven311[S] • 9 points • 8 May, 2018 11:17 PM

That's an interesting way of analyzing it.

Unrelenting • 43 points • 9 May, 2018 12:23 AM

No amount of social posturing can usurp basic biological urges. With the dissolution of monogamy these trends will continue to rise as women fulfill their hypergamous drives in the absence of economic and ethical repercussion. This literally happens every time there's an abundance of resources. Equitable societies free women from the need to be dependent on men and therefore they choose only to mate with the man with the most provisional and genetic value possible, often preferring to die alone rather than settle for anything less than their masculine ideal if she needn't be dependent upon a man she perceives as weak in order to survive. This is the price we pay for becoming soft and agreeable pursuant to the advent of the abundance procured from our military and industrial enterprises.

Reven311[S] • 18 points • 9 May, 2018 12:32 AM

Monogamy is still a useful device to entrap certain high value men higher on the agreeableness scale of the Big 5 and monopolize their high quality sperm and resources for their own high value reproduction, to the exclusion of other women (the competition). Even in extreme socialistic structures like Norway, the absence of economics is never going to become a reality, unless

automation puts half of men out of work or something. But that's entirely speculative at this point. You are correct that equitable structures favor female reproductive strategies, which is why they tend to recycle the higher value men willing to reproduce with many women and discard the rest. If the cost of living continues to rise, this will only become more pronounced, since only about 40% of college students are men.

What I see happening is the bottom 40-50% of men banding together and sparking a political revolution of some kind, similar to the way white men without a college degree banded together and voted for Trump in 2016 in a way they haven't done in many years, perhaps in living memory. This will continue and expand, and if their demands are not met, then all hell will break loose eventually.

Unrealenting • 19 points • 9 May, 2018 01:18 AM*

At best, women will use monogamy to extract your resources and dip out with your kids. Monogamy is a losing game for men if women don't require their resources, unless the level of inequity in your favor is so high that she'd suffer severely in provisional procurement relatively speaking if the relationship ends due to an inability to branch swing to a man of similar social/financial standing.

Welcome to the r-selection mating market.

Indeed. For instance, "White Nationalism" is on the rise and a direct consequence of this rise in equity and relative abundance that has allowed Women to shirk motherhood and monogamy with little to no consequence due to a preponderance of safety nets and economic opportunity that makes dependence on a relatively mentally and physically weak male obsolete, especially since there are a myriad of men with similar provisional value she can easily branch swing to with little to no economic or social consequence. The best course of action is to enjoy the decline and hone your non-wealth related advantages over other men in terms of bravery, intellect, and muscularity through the mastery of frame, game, and lifting so that you are ready for the inevitable economic implosion that will undo hundreds of years of previously established order and class systems.

Welcome to one of the last refuges of rational thought brother.

whine_and_cheese • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 08:10 AM

But I tell you this, man, I tell you this. I don't know what's gonna happen, man, but I wanna have my kicks before the whole shithouse goes up in flames
Alright!

untonyto • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 06:27 AM

Well put. A comprehensive manifesto with a concrete strategic plan.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 03:52 PM

unless the level of inequity in your favor is so high that she'd suffer severely in provisional procurement relatively speaking if the relationship ends due to an inability to branch swing to a man of similar social/financial standing.

Exactly, we agree 100%. Freedom is just chaos, order can only be maintained in the long run via social repression in a variety of forms that are proven to work historically. Women

should not be allowed to pursue a college degree unless they're 30 years old and already have two children with a suitable beta.

WolfgangBreitweit • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 09:12 AM

But since she can have more than one child with more wealthy guys, she doesn't need the monopoly at all in respect to reproduction.

WolfgangBreitweit • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 03:51 AM

Thanks, But it's obvious. She'd rather share a millionaire with five other chicks, than having a poor guy on her own.

ApexmanRP • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 09:01 AM

Ha! I was looking for a word to link it to harems, thanks man. Exactly.

tempolaca • 21 points • 9 May, 2018 12:17 AM

I have a child and it hasn't turned out to be the hindrance I thought it would be. No women, from 19 to 35, has ever turned me down when they found out I'm a father.

ApexmanRP • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 08:59 AM

Yes, I think if you have a high enough SMV, women see this as a positive or at least a neutral.

Troll_Name • 35 points • 8 May, 2018 08:20 PM

Marriage has a remarkable synergy with female hypergamy.

ApexmanRP • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 09:08 AM

Marriage is one tool in women's sexual strategy.

Entropy-7 • 7 points • 8 May, 2018 11:53 PM

It's what I call "serial polygamy".

ApexmanRP • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 09:00 AM

Yes, and its coming to a town near you..

etherealembryo • 5 points • 8 May, 2018 11:04 PM

I see this as they both are in the same place with their lives. I dated single mothers and there are things i dont do that guys with kids do automatically. I like my life with no kids.

ApexmanRP • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 09:02 AM

I get you. I love my time without my kids now. I don't think i could live with them full time now.

Men are meant to have a mission, not be nursemaids.

SKRedPill • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 04:22 AM

No, it looks like this is a case of sharing beta providers.

ApexmanRP • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 08:49 AM

I didn't say "sharing alphas" I said sharing the "best" men, and in Norway, yes that's betas with proven

sperm.

dulkemaru51 • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 08:09 AM

Just the 80/20 rule of forwarded genes...

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 May, 2018 09:19 PM

Men are either all or nothing.

red_matrix • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 11:46 AM

"What actually happens often is that men who are already fathers get recycled."

Don't forget, Telegony is a real thing!

ApexmanRP • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:18 PM

HA! I wish it was.. I had an image of my ex's new baby (with a different man) looking like me.. how sweet would that be?

ssr401 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:32 PM

Nope it's a fake thing with 0 scientific evidence in mammals.

UselessBrakes • 132 points • 9 May, 2018 12:53 AM

I am norwegian and I would like to point out some things that could help explain why such a large porportion of men are deemed unattractive by women.

1) The cost of living, and especially housing, is extremely expensive in Norway. It is impossible to buy a house with enough space for children unless both partners have a decent, full time job. This would give working-class men a huge disadvantage, because women are aware of the fact that the family would not be able to cope financially if a she chose such a man.

2) Education is free and avalible to everyone in Norway (although students compete for the most attractive courses using grades from high school.) This means that hardworking men with good cognitive skills can easily make their way to good jobs. This causes both money and cognitive abilities to get concentrated in the top tier of society, making some men so attractive they get "recycled" by women.

Any person could however get into a course that would give them a high-salary job, (not law, medicine or engineering, but still good high-paying jobs), but not everyone is able to complete the degrees. Working class men in Norway typically lack the mental capacity to get any education at all, and this is why they are stuck in the working class. Women value skills that are worth passing on to children as well as the ability to provide for said children when choosing a man. So the working class males lack both the cognitive skills as well as the money required to afford children at all. This makes them "twice" as uninteresting to women as a partner.

3) Women perform better than men in school, so most students in courses like law and medicine in Norway are female. Since women prefer to date "up", this makes it difficult for some women to get a mate. The child-less 14% of norwegian women are often well educated and belong to the "cultural" upper tier of society. The 24% of childless men do however belong to the uneducated "underclass" of society. Even if both these groups wanted to find a partner and have a family, the "cultural" and class differences between them would make them a missmatch, not to mention they probably would not be able to provide for the family financially.

4) Not only do women perform better than men in education. They are also a lot better at looking after their health, eating right, exercing and managing their money than men. This causes women to have better health,

higher life expectancy, (presumably better looks), and so on than men. Since women prefer to date "up" this makes the "mechanism" from point 3 even stronger.

5) Women in Norway are a lot more social than men, and also make up the majority of students. This means that men who are students and also are outgoing will get in touch with a lot of women and probably have more luck in dating as a result. These men get "recycled" as boyfriends/sexual partners by many women.

Men who are not students, and spend a lot of time at home or in male-dominated professions lack the platform for getting in touch with women at all. This makes the "gap" between working class males and females yet bigger.

I hope this made sense. Apologies for my english :)

MattyAnon • 12 points • 9 May, 2018 01:41 PM

They are also a lot better at looking after their health, eating right, exercising and managing their money than men.

Health yes - women don't hesitate to turn to others for health. Managing their money? Really? Are Norwegian women different to the rest of the world? Because in the US/UK, women have less expenses and men pay for more dates. Women get better social support and men pay more tax. Women don't save because they know they'll get married. Men build their lives hoping to attract a mate.

This causes women to have better health, higher life expectancy, (presumably better looks), and so on than men.

Women likely have a higher inherent biological life expectancy, due to pursuing a lower risk life strategy. Workplace death is higher in men which contributes to lower life expectancy.

Are you sure you're not being misled by a narrative that blames men?

Not only do women perform better than men in education.

Women perform better in the current gynocentric education system. Men used to perform better, but they changed all the education types. When women underperformed, the world screamed "change the education system, it must be wrong!". Now that men underperform, we simply blame men for under performing.

Women get support. Men get blame.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 20 points • 9 May, 2018 11:14 AM

Previous studies have shown that in the West on average, men pay taxes and women get benefits over the course of their life. It's net theft from men and given to women. Without this, women would want working class men for their money.

But the state is already giving them their money, so why would they have to offer anything in return like fertility?

And I expect that in Norway, like in other feminist countries (aka the west), education has been restructured for female performance, which is why women perform better in school.

I reckon the gap of where men and women meet is the tiniest of all these effects; if it was in women's interest they would find the men.

UselessBrakes • 12 points • 9 May, 2018 12:00 PM

Although there might be some truth in this, the 25% bottom of men will typically be in low income-jobs, on welfare or unemployed, and have worse health than average. So these men are also typically net

recievers of benefits in society.

If anything, lack of state benefits would give women an extra incentive to «share» a top, wealthy male instead of getting a poorer/less healthy man for themselves.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 12:52 PM

All accurate, but I still think you miss the bigger picture.

Only those who manage to attract from the top get to share the top.

When survival is at stake, a low income male is desirable because at least it is an income-male.

And there's an inherent risk to trying to share a man; you might easily fall out of favor and support. Now the risk isn't so big, because it just means she has less money. But when the risk is starvation or complete destitution instead as it was before the welfare state, then plenty of cautious women wouldn't have gambled after mr. christian grey, but taken security with Bob from around the corner.

After all, when given a choice, women will choose security over opportunity nearly every time. But when they get security for free, with no duties or responsibilities, they'll take opportunity as well.

bob13bob • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 05:32 PM

thats because men used to earn more than women. however, that's changing drastically even in the usa. under 30 women are more educated and tend to earn more.

WelfareWarriorZ • 3 points • 10 May, 2018 12:26 PM

Norwegian american here, Jeg kommer du fra kristiansand. I learned a lot from what you've stated in your near perfect english. Now laugh at my norsk. Tusen takk :)

ozaku7 • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 12:32 AM

I was on a date once with a norwegian and what stood out was that she was complaining about how norwegian men are not men but pussies who stand in front of the mirror too long working on their looks instead of character.

DodgedAFew[] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 11:12 AM

Do they like foreign dick though? English speaking at least?

UselessBrakes • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:32 PM

Some do, i guess. But the same requirements for looks/interests/ careers apply.

Scroober92 • 1 points • 8 May, 2018 11:39 PM **[recovered]**

I want to dispute one of the common things that I hear from the manosphere when it comes to talking about welfare states etc:

One of the fascinating things about Norway is that the government taxes everything quite heavily.. There is a 25% VAT tax on EVERYTHING you buy, and its even higher on certain products. There are also hidden fees etc.

The result of this is that prices on items and things is incredibly high. In the past we have compensated for this by the fact that our population is quite small (5 million) compared to how big we are, and how much natural resources there are. Essentially the demand for labour has been big, and additionally we have a strong culture for unions and fair wage distribution. Our workers are also very productive when they are at work etc, making up for the fact that our workhours are much lower than other developed nations.

The result of all this? Higher birth rates than most western nations due to more men at work (more beta bux men invested and more beta bux men holding value)

As our population increased the demand for labour stayed somewhat stagnant, mostly due to technology replacing jobs like everywhere else... but the jobs replaced are mostly in the working class.

“When Norwegian men from the working class have children, it is more often by chance,” explains Jensen.”

The curious case of Norway is that most of the men that grow childless are not being outcompeted by "chads" or the dark triad alpha types, they are being outcompeted by guys higher up on the socioeconomic ladder.

The guys that usually have 1-3 marriages and several kids with several women tend to be guys that work in higher paying professions. Doctors, lawyers etc. Guys that are not necessarily extremely fit or alpha in the traditional sense, but guys who are high on the socioeconomic ladder.

This is why I would dispute the argument that women dont NEED guys anymore, that they can just get paid by the state.. THEY CANT.. The state exists mostly as a revenue collector at this point, and they mostly only pay for things like schools.. If women want to live a good life in Norway they need to work a lot or marry a well-paid man.

Norwegian women are gold diggers, not outright, but very selective when it comes to picking men who has a car, house etc.

If you want to live a beta bux lifestyle and you work a high paying profession then Norway is actually quite a good option.

Reven311[S] • 6 points • 8 May, 2018 11:44 PM

Yes, but a higher proportion of men are not reproducing in Norway vs other Western nations. This is a problem for the useless middle-aged men of society that will inevitably die alone.

Scroober92 • 1 points • 8 May, 2018 11:56 PM [recovered]

Yes, but a higher proportion of men are not reproducing in Norway vs other Western nations.

As I said, it has to do with our unique societal model. We have high taxes and prices, which means if you dont want to live in "Relative" poverty you have to work a lot/ be in a high-paying profession. As a result our culture and way of determining peoples value is heavily tied to what we do for work, and how much we make. The first thing someone will ask you if you talk to them in Norway is "So what do you do?"..

This is a problem for the useless middle-aged men of society that will inevitably die alone.

Sure, but its not my problem. Also, remember the last time Norway had an abundance of men without hope of getting a wife or land for themselves? Viking age..

Im not saying that Norwegian men are going to build wooden boats and put on pointy hats (we never did btw).. but once that segment of the population grows large enough they will mobilize and figure out their own solutions.. those that dont.. well, they dont deserve to reproduce.

Reven311[S] • 9 points • 9 May, 2018 12:00 AM

Lots of western countries have high taxes and prices. It's the extreme egalitarianism and feminism that creates a larger group of useless males. Women rule Norway to a large extent, so they have imposed a system that favors their reproduction to a large extent as well.

Sure, but its not my problem.

By your own admission it will eventually be a problem that will affect your life when the mass of

useless men grows too large, it will reach a breaking point and chaos will ensue.

Scroober92 • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 12:03 AM [recovered]

it will reach a breaking point and chaos will ensue.

A problem for men who depend of civilization for sure. For a guy living self-sufficient on his own farm in the middle of nowhere? nope.

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 12:09 AM

I see, well if that's you, then you should be fine when society collapses. Good luck.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 11:04 AM

He is - that's most of us here bruh.

What do you think we mean when we say enjoy the decline?

AloysiusC • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 08:24 PM

Talk about being short sighted. Here's a flash: you won't always be healthy and self sufficient. The day will come when you are most definitely not those things. And it has a knack of coming way sooner than you expect.

Reven311[S] • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 05:22 PM

Most people don't live on a farm in a rural place that's safe during chaos. I'm willing to bet you're dependent on social structures in place and built by patriarchy. These will crumble one day and lead to starvation and generalized unrest. Plan accordingly.

HAMMURABI • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 01:25 PM

Can you not answer without your disgusting smugness? Unbelievable.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 11:12 AM

And future generations of men will learn from this and go NEET. You can't keep squeezing that golden egg laying goose forever.

ozaku7 • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 12:37 AM

This is not a problem but an opportunity to filter the genetically weak out.

Reven311[S] • 0 points • 11 May, 2018 02:48 AM

Sure, but they keep letting muslims and others in that are far worse and inbred with their own cousins. We need to reproduce at 2.1 children per woman or society collapses.

ozaku7 • 1 point • 27 May, 2018 01:34 AM

It just shrinks, that's all. Let the elder people simply work longer. They can perfectly do student jobs like being cashiers, receptionists or whatever. The entire dream of retiring and doing shit at home, watching TV all day until the day you die is the reason why most societies start fucking up lately too.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 27 May, 2018 01:50 AM

It shrinks the economy and reduces our capacity to fund the retirement of the elderly, even if

they work till 70. There is also a great deal of business demand for immigration with a falling population, because they need new sources of customers. Old people don't buy much shit in retirement. It's a downward spiral.

bob13bob • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 12:45 AM

I think this has more to do with behavioral economics than human attraction. rich baby daddy vs poor baby daddy. the decision to abort or keep a child or even to get pregnant might have 1m incentive to it, and many know it. if we saw who was having sex vs who was having kids, then we might see better data on attraction. many if not most industrialized nations have VATS or some other kind of tariff. that actually work to protect the middle class. I advocate one in the USA to have one as well.

there are things happening at hte bototm and top of the spectrum. at the poor end of the spectrum there is truth to welfare state suporting a certain tier of lifestyle. one might argue that public school itself is a social welfare (it is) and middle class people wouldn't be able to have 4 kids without it. The state and tax base is definitely getting cucked. However in USA, the problem is is more than child welfare (a non voting base), it's social security and military and other corporate welfare, 50% military and 25% social security of our fed budget. it's my incentive to grow tax paying paying smart americans, while i'm paying lockheed for bombers to blowup shanty towns in the middle of nowhere. aso social security is not self-paid, is always paid for by the next generation.

at the top end, a "decent" life will need a rather well off man.

how do we define "outcompete". we know how many offspring, but many men now are refusing to have kids how might have 10x the sexual partners as a median man.

i won't criticize women for wanting to pair up with a well off man. As a man, I select for earning power, as do most men in silicon valley.

dazed111 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 09:28 AM

I was disgusted by how high the prices were when I was in Norway. Beautiful country though

Hammoch • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 03:29 PM

This is why I would dispute the argument that women dont NEED guys anymore, that they can just get paid by the state.. THEY CANT.. The state exists mostly as a revenue collector at this point, and they mostly only pay for things like schools.. If women want to live a good life in Norway they need to work a lot or marry a well-paid man.

If you are from Norway, you would know that this statement is not completely true. Single mothers that isn't working get help from the state on top of child support until the kid is 18.

fcjnews • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 06:16 PM [recovered]

What would be considered the threshold for a desirable income there?

Scroober92 • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 08:28 PM [recovered]

450k and up generally speaking. Which is like 55k USD. That is pre-tax though.. We tax like 20-40% of our income based on how high a tax bracket you are in.

fcjnews • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 08:52 PM [recovered]

Huh, I would have expected more given how much everything costs there. I feel like in major US

cities it's around \$80k where your income alone starts to be noticeably desirable. You can see the uptick here. What type of job would be earning 55k there? I assume the doctor/lawyer incomes would be quite a bit higher?

the_Elders • 1 points • 8 May, 2018 08:29 PM [recovered]

From 1985 until now the internet steadily grew. Could this rise in betas simply be the bottom 25% checking out of society and finding happiness somewhere else?

When virtual sex and robot girls become popular in 50 years will we see this number of childless persons rise to astronomical proportions? Why fuck a "real" girl when you could have a supermodel identical to the real thing?

Reven311[S] • 83 points • 8 May, 2018 08:37 PM

I don't think the majority of it is voluntary, it's involuntary because men are less attractive with less money in comparison to women who can support themselves to a large extent.

ucfgavin • 60 points • 8 May, 2018 09:35 PM

That, and because women still shoot for men on a higher rung of the ladder, the bar is automatically set higher to that bottom 25%.

[deleted] • 49 points • 8 May, 2018 10:47 PM

This is the truth. If median income for women rises, then we can easily assume the median woman will see a shrinking pool of "acceptable" men to breed with. As women would choose to only breed with men who make more or are of higher social status. Women won't breed down.

Unrealenting • 15 points • 9 May, 2018 12:29 AM

Keep in mind that wealth is a merely an ascetic to genetic value. As equity rises women require men less and thus select to mate with men who have high genetic value regardless of wealth, eroding the ethical consequences of such pursuits through misdirection and social destabilization until it is normalized. Wealth is a man's concession in courtship to supplement his masculine phenotypical expression and genetic value, not a woman's. If they can do without a man's money they will gladly do so and pursue their masculine ideal through their hypergamous impetus.

Hoodwink • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 02:18 AM*

genetic value, not a woman's

Just a note that this can be complicated with enough wealth. Women can 'buy' beauty through surgery, make-up, and healthy-living. It's not guaranteed, and it's a choice they make with their money, but the connection between money and beauty is there.

Unrealenting • 8 points • 9 May, 2018 02:30 AM*

Guys aren't too picky when they're horny and want something to fuck and no one will find out about it, even, and perhaps especially, Alphas. Women have a MUCH higher standard for physical aesthetics when it comes to sexual selection than males. No matter how she looks there will almost always be an Alpha Male willing to fuck down that she can get sex from.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:32 PM

We're talking about men with whom women would give children to (according to the article).

In that case, I believe trends show that women, no matter how much money they make, would tend to choose men who make more money and have more status to form families with.

That's not to say successful women wouldn't be single moms by choice, but in that case fathers are still missing out on having children and are merely vehicles through which women can achieve single mother status.

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 05:25 PM

The more money women make the fewer men they are willing to reproduce with, it's as simple as that. Then society will collapse, because women were not meant to be self-sufficient, it's not their natural condition. Civilization was built by spreading the sexual wealth to beta males to extract productivity and support social stability and long term demographic sustainability.

[deleted] • 42 points • 8 May, 2018 11:04 PM

This makes me feel bad for incels...

Reven311[S] • 54 points • 8 May, 2018 11:18 PM

It should, because you have a normal level of empathy for people who don't deserve to be forever alone through no fault of their own.

Parara_papapapaVeis • 1 points • 8 May, 2018 11:47 PM **[recovered]**

They lost the genetic lottery, there is no hope

upyoars • 43 points • 9 May, 2018 12:01 AM

Losing the genetic lottery doesn't mean there's **no hope**. That's a horrible mindset. Hard work 100% trumps everything. A guy who learned red-pill and trained specifically to become an alpha after being a beta for many years can exceed a "natural alpha" who got everything good going for him since birth in regards to reproductive success and all the traits an alpha should have. "Natural" alphas tend to take things for granted and haven't developed a strong work ethic to overcome hardships and adversity in life.

Reven311[S] • 19 points • 9 May, 2018 12:17 AM

That's true, hard work goes a long way, but you have to fight past the depression and push forward no matter what. That takes real grit, which unfortunately a lot of weak men are lacking in.

Yourstruly777 • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 04:55 AM

That is also in the genetic lottery, obviously.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 05:26 PM

To some extent yes, but even weak men can learn to be better. That's what people are doing here, seeking answers. It's why men are listening to Jordan Peterson as well.

1z1z2x2x3c3c4v4v • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:32 PM

a lot of weak men are lacking in.

There is a difference between being physically unable to do something, as compared to just not knowing how...

The skills to approach and date women can be taught and learned by most men (assuming there is no mental defects like autism).

In my experience, most of these guys who claim they can't, really just don't have the skills. They can learn if they wanted to. Its not hard.

I mean, for Gods sake, this is the Information Age... anything you want to know is just a few clicks away, with video examples and courses just a few more clicks away... Anything you want to know...

These guys are indeed weak, but not in the way you think.

"Nothing can stop the man with the right mental attitude from achieving his goal; nothing on earth can help the man with the wrong mental attitude." ~wrongly attributed to Thomas Jefferson.

So for some of them, they can indeed be taught. They just don't know it. But others, its their own mental attitude that will forever hold them back. They are indeed incels forever.

Reven311[S] • 3 points • 8 May, 2018 11:50 PM

If society collapses there is hope... and that may be exactly what happens.

Unrealenting • 9 points • 9 May, 2018 12:34 AM

No there isn't. Collapse would equalize everyone and leave most men out of the gene pool, as is already happening now through the slow and inevitable collapse of the republic. However, being in this sub and being aware of this information puts you closer to the winning side of this inequity.

Reven311[S] • 10 points • 9 May, 2018 12:36 AM

Collapse means women can no longer support themselves economically or feed their own children or protect themselves. This is why society imposed monogamy on the world in the first place, it's the only stable form of reproduction in the long run, unless you live as hunter/gatherers (which cannot support a large population, only farming can).

Unrealenting • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 01:29 AM*

Neither will men. And women don't find men that are equal to them, especially in terms of scarcity, sexually viable.

Chaos is, above all else, fair and equal. Chaos is the enemy of the male mating strategy. As we creep further into economic collapse women will require men less and less, accelerating their hypergamy and allowing them to mate solely with men who have an inequitable advantage in terms of genetic value, which is largely unchangeable. The inability of men to usurp this mating strategy and the Chaos it feeds on is through the Order created by financial inequity, wherein a man can work hard and overcome his genetic inequities by greatly increasing his provisional value through monetary acquisition that is far higher than what a woman can achieve, allowing her to enter into the civic contract of monogamy and

rearing children without the fear that your provisional value will falter and leave her and her offspring incapable of surviving without having to labor at an equal level to you. It's what the whole damn system is built on. It's why men build technology and form armies, to establish order through Patriarchal Rule wherein the Man has enough resources relative to the woman that she needn't ever worry about your ability to protect and provide for her and her children.

As this Order collapses Women will go back to the old days of r-selection mating strategies, choosing to mate only with those that have the highest genetic value in terms of being able to deal with the ever present physical threats of a Chaotic environment. Most men can't compete under this Matriarchal Rule and will be cast out of the gene pool by women due to the exploitability of their genetic weaknesses by braver, smarter, and stronger men in the absence of the protection that high provision capabilities and resource abundance affords them in an Ordered society with well-defined social/financial classes that reject and shame those who do not conform to them.

Reven311[S] • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 01:38 AM

If it's unsafe for a female to leave the house without being raped during this chaos, it sounds like they will need a man to protect them, even if it's a beta. One alpha isn't going to protect a harem of women during chaos. Women need to extract male protection and provisioning via sex during chaotic times, which basically dominated through most of the dark ages of Europe. When women are stripped of capacity to provide for themselves their only choice is a dependable beta that won't leave her to die. Mating with just the highest value males during chaos won't help when he disappears to fuck another woman. You're underestimating how helpless women really are absent an efficient and technological police state protecting them from the cold hard reality of this world.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:07 AM

Collapse would be good - it would mean that men capable of taking resources by force and holding onto them would survive. This would equalize things, men would gather into groups take resources from the weak and accumulate women which would then be distributed according to merit to ensure the most optimal functioning of the group.

Collapse would be a hard reset.

Unrealenting • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:09 AM

Exactly, it's GREAT if you're a strong red piller man.

Chaddeus_Rex • 2 points • 10 May, 2018 02:22 AM

Exactly.

We see this play out in Syria where rebel warlords gather armies and women flock to them.

Madxgoat • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 01:03 AM

I mean they could just buy a proustite then fucking get on with their lives lol

Parara_papapapaVeis • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 01:56 AM

The point isn't sex, is being seen as desirable, receive love and stuff

timleif • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 06:45 AM

Yeah of late RoK posts have been talking about the emptiness of hedonism.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:52 PM

I'm glad that RoK is moving beyond hedonism and just "enjoying the decline."

Men must fill the void in their soul with something real.

Celicni • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 12:31 PM

Involuntary celibate sounds better than "Involuntary without any kind of emotional contact or love from women".

Rian_Stone • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 06:48 PM

feel bad for this:

1 charismatic leader can tap into their grievances to get all manner of things done, usually not to help the status quo

Linoran • 37 points • 8 May, 2018 10:10 PM

Maybe then women will put in some effort again to be desirable. Just look at the UK, the women are garbage.

Guardian_of_Justice • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 01:53 AM

I've heard this so much. Why is that?

DodgedAFew[] • 8 points • 9 May, 2018 11:15 AM

Get fat very quickly. Then get tattoos and fake tan to counterbalance that.

Guardian_of_Justice • 2 points • 10 May, 2018 08:51 AM

And still shoot for a top Chad 8/10?

TheDreadnought1 • 13 points • 8 May, 2018 09:47 PM

This is the second sexual revolution

Parara_papapapaVeis • 10 points • 8 May, 2018 11:47 PM

A supermodel that won't betray you, and won't feel disdain if you can't pay the bills

Throwaway_Old_Guy • 8 points • 9 May, 2018 01:10 AM

They will likely incorporate a special receptacle to keep the deposited sperm viable so it can be harvested for IVF to waiting patients.

You won't have to deal with women, but you'll still have to pay.

NSFWIssue • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 03:08 AM

It will never be exactly voluntary, just stronger and stronger bait to the NEET side of masculinity

Joey_Lopez • 3 points • 10 May, 2018 10:52 PM

It's probably more due to the fact that females have less need for a BB. So when they don't need a BB it's only the Alpha Fuxs that reproduce. I just wonder what will happen to society once the red pill goes mainstream and men decide that there is no point in being a BB. Why become an account or scientist when you can get more pussy by going to the gym instead?

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 11:18 AM

Why fuck a "real" girl when you could have a supermodel identical to the real thing?

Because every sense in your body will tell you it is as fake as your hand.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 02:47 PM

Good point actually, a lot of the pleasure comes from mentally knowing you've achieved sex with a desirable chick. But sex robots would still stave off the general thirst of the male population

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:55 PM

So could masturbation.

I won't say sex robots won't have a place in the marketplace or the sexual marketplace, because they will, but I think we have sex for a lot more reasons than just the orgasm and I also don't think the experience of sex with a doll or a person is close to comparable.

And male sexuality is pretty persistent. Even for those that enjoy the sex robots, why settle for just a sex robot?

Even if the experiences were similar (and I can't imagine they would be), then at least a girls knows how to wash herself. That's at least a skill most girls still have.

the_Elders • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 12:31 PM **[recovered]**

There is nothing magical about pussy. If there is money to be made it will be faked to a very convincing level.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 12:43 PM

I suppose that "convincingness" depends on how easily you are fooled.

It's too fake for me if she doesn't torch my car after I fuck her best friend.

Federkiel • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 07:39 PM

Maybe to get out of society and get enlightened? To have the chance to get to see that's all one laughable game.

rorrr[] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 07:04 AM

It will take less than 50 years. 20 maybe.

Wrath_of_Trump • 30 points • 8 May, 2018 11:05 PM

Sometimes you have to force people to be free. Their individualist ideology masquerades as freedom, but they

live in misery. You are watching the birth of fascism around the world as men face the crisis of oblivion and feel powerless in their own world, they will embrace someone who channels their frustration and promises to fix it even if it means a radical, top-down reorganization of society at the barrel of a gun. They would rather serve than die, and they're not wrong.

Reven311[S] • 21 points • 8 May, 2018 11:26 PM

This is why white men without a college degree voted for Trump overwhelmingly in record numbers. They're voting like they're under threat, and they're not wrong. They're seeking a peaceful resolution to the current state of affairs, but it doesn't appear likely they will be satisfied in the current political dynamic.

Wrath_of_Trump • 12 points • 8 May, 2018 11:48 PM

It's also how Iran went from bikinis to burkas in the 70's. I don't think the US will get to that point, but it will become inhospitable for many people. Concessions will be made in order to keep the gravy train rolling, we may see more conservative leaders roll back laws to give the impressions things are changing, but in reality its water under bridge. Men have to learn to reject feminism, and reject being told that their nature is evil and has no place in the world. And they will, it's a foregone conclusion, even if that means all the betas have to die. The offspring of alphas in a hypergamous world means an increase in masculine men (with no fathers) who will lead the world into renewed conflict for superiority once modern history begins to fade into irrelevancy.

Reven311[S] • 10 points • 8 May, 2018 11:52 PM*

I'm not a fan of Iran, but they did recognize the threat that feminism poses to infect their society and destroy it from within. I'm not a fan of Islam, but at least they got rid of the feminism. They didn't need to throw the baby out with the bathwater and become a regressive regime though. But maybe that unavoidable. I don't precisely know.

Wrath_of_Trump • 6 points • 8 May, 2018 11:58 PM

The regime has to reflect the views of the people, people are comfortable keeping their culture at the expense of being not being exposed to foreign influence. The west has a problem in that feminism was born out of it and can't disown it, it can only radically change the conditions that allow for it by reverting or creating a new social order. Whatever it chooses will be the will of the next 2 or 3 generations who are the offspring of the highly-selected males.

Reven311[S] • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 12:05 AM

The percentage of muslim men in Norway expanded by 50% in the last 6 years (before the recent Syrian migration). This is going to end by cultural replacement by men who will not put up with women who demand equality. Then the displaced white men will maybe join Islam in solidarity with the newcomers who seek to overturn the old order and establish patriarchy once again.

Wrath_of_Trump • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 12:16 AM

I only see the betas joining Islam, making it more impotent after they perversely try to westernize it. By the time they actually have any numbers, a good portion of them will be LGBT friendly. They won't feel the existential crisis, they won't feel a need to fight for Islam or the west. They aren't fighters, period, and the ones who left their country did so in cowardice not as conquerors. When it gets hot, they'll leave just like they did before.

Reven311[S] • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 12:23 AM

I dunno, it will certainly be fascinating to see how it all unfolds. I don't see Muslim men giving up their way of life and embracing a faggot's way of life.

Wrath_of_Trump • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 12:25 AM*

A generation of boomers who have it good can ruin everything. The Muslims who really wanted to live what they believed all got exterminated, it's really cruel how the west built them up to murder them.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 11:21 AM

islam

lgbt friendly

This will never really happen. It's an alliance of convenience that has no lasting power.

Wrath_of_Trump • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 03:07 PM

I don't think so, these guys had Islamic societies and they left. They don't want that shit anymore, they want the shiny bullshit we've had for decades. Their women want to wear dresses and not pay the consequences for hypergamy. For the same reason a loser can't put down the porn, the pipe, or the controller, they are going to fall for the "western values" meme. It's already happening, friend.

<http://www.newsweek.com/muslim-white-evangelical-gay-marriage-907627>

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 03:16 PM

They don't want that shit anymore

I can tell you're writing this from an american perspective.

Muslims change when they reach certain amounts of critical mass. You can go to dearborn if you're in any doubt about that, or any of the european capitals.

They live according to their greatest example, Muhammed, and Muhammed ingratiated himself with the Median people by emphasizing how similar his new islamic religion was to the existing religion/cultural mores. At least until they were big enough to militarily seize control and force convert everyone, and place the death penalty on leaving. Look at the history of egypt, lybia, it repeats itself over and over again.

Once there are sufficient muslims, they will once again lock each other into the deathspiral that is islam. Because the children of the people you describe here, will wonder why they're different from other people or they'll be interested in islam initially as a western girl might be a buddhism or yoga, but once they get into it, they'll eschew alcohol, music, start to pray 5 times a day, go to mecca, learn how to be a proper muslim.

They'll learn what a muslim must live like and prescribe it to other muslims.

I'll say it again: it's an alliance of convenience. There may be handful of exceptions, but that's why we call them exceptions. And the more muslims you get, the fewer exceptions there will be. Oh, there will be many muslims that don't believe, but just saying that might get you excommunicated from your family, if not call violence to yourself.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 05:28 PM

They don't want that shit anymore

No, they left Islamic societies to extract wealth from white people that subsidize their own reproduction with welfare systems. They're inherently parasitic on Western cultures.

blownnnn • 1 point • 13 May, 2018 06:21 PM

Feminism is being used to cause division in the west. Since women are making it more difficult for most men to get sex and the risk of #metoo. Men in power are just going to escorts which are owned by Russian and/or Chinese criminal organizations.

Western women are seriously aiding these efforts to undermine western culture. Equality, culturally and economically, doesn't work in capitalism. We can look at Norway, Canada and Sweden for example. Social states blaming capitalism for it's downfall. It's just disgraceful to hear western men and women accept socialism, like millions died to stamp out it's ability to cause chaos in the world.

WE can talk all about being ALPHA, INCEL, and BETA bullshit, but neither group is stepping up to make our known way of life exist into the new world. While we in-fight each other about how to be act as a "man", our communities are fundamentally being destroyed. In this case, we all share one common trait, we have all failed western ideology.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:12 AM

Many upperclass Iranians support feminism. Many upperclass Iranian women are hypergamous as fuck and gold diggers. Even as students in undergrad, they will not date guys with anything older than a 2016 Mercedes even if they find him attractive.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:16 AM

Sure upper class, that's normal. But that's a relatively small percentage of the population.

OneU • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 09:52 AM

Honestly, it's no one's fault they're dumb. Go get an engineering degree and you might stop feeling threatened.

PanderjitSingh • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 12:52 PM

Men's poorer performance in education is something new and was engineered by feminists. It is someone's fault.

OneU • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:56 PM

Do you have any theory on this?

Europe4ever • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 06:50 AM

Freedom can be so much, for example this degenerate world we live in today. Men are cast aside, western leaders replacing their own kin, flamboyant/degenerate = brave etc. I don't know what the best option is, but Fascism is better than where we are and where we are heading. It's not the boogeyman.

The freedom fetish we have seen the last 70 years have done tremendous damage to our world because

children have been taught all and any freedoms are good no matter what. Freedom is a neutral term with positives and negatives, but when society solely focuses on the positive aspects of freedom the negative can flourish. Freedom to destroy cultures from within, freedom to do what ever we want despite the cost on everything which made our lives possible in the first place. Freedom to destroy the heritage we are leaving or descendants and the freedom to celebrate ourselves as progressives as we do it. Freedom to do whatever we want includes negatives. Liberalism is degeneracy.

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 10 May, 2018 01:40 AM

Freedom has to be balanced by responsibility. If people shirk their responsibilities, then they have to be forced to comply. It's as simple as that. Dark days are ahead, but there's light at the end of the tunnel eventually.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:10 AM

That is why slavery is more just than freedom - many who are 'free' but miserable would be better off as slaves. They'd be taken care of, taught skills and be given a purpose. The ambitious will break free and make something of themselves. Its a just system.

Fascism is a masculine ideology. It is one of strength. It values strength, beauty and ambition. It values family. It despises weakness both physical and mental. It welcomes challenges.

Hjalmbere • 59 points • 8 May, 2018 08:24 PM

I would really like to see details on ethnicity. It might very well be that recent immigrants bring the total of non-reproducing males down since many of them are in arranged marriages. Among ethnic Norwegians it's probably higher.

I would also be really interested in seeing stats on the correlation between men not reproducing and factors such as body fat percentage, iq, geography (bigger or smaller cities), alcohol consumption, gaming, drug abuse, whether non-reproductive men are sons of single mothers, have sisters, and porn consumption.

[deleted] • 40 points • 8 May, 2018 09:11 PM

I'd say the opposite. Immigrants tend to have many kids; they're your social stability when you can no longer work. If you have no pension, you rely on your kids.

As a result, among ethnic Norwegians, I'd say the percentage of men who are fatherless is much higher.

chinawinsworlds • 9 points • 8 May, 2018 09:45 PM

Probably correct. Many of us CHOOSE to not get kids. I could easily be a father in 9 months if I wanted to, but why would I? I like spending time without kids there.

Scroober92 • 1 points • 8 May, 2018 11:45 PM **[recovered]**

Immigrants have many kids. Their children actually have the same number of kids as the Norwegian average. Thats western cultural intergration at work right there xD

Hjalmbere • 10 points • 9 May, 2018 03:57 AM*

Immigration to Scandinavian countries have shifted from European neighbors to far off clan cultures that are considerably more resistant to the allure of secularism and birth control. I think you will find that the birth rate of the second generation of today's newcomers will not drop as much as the birth rate of second generation Greek or Yugoslav immigrants that came in the 70s or 80s did.

HerbertRTarlek Jr • 27 points • 8 May, 2018 11:18 PM

Yeah, but the most worthless males in the US have babies like mad, and their baby mamas get money from the taxpayers.

[deleted] • 12 points • 9 May, 2018 01:58 AM

Thats because they are too stupid to use birth control. The majority of Chads aren't knocking girls up because they and the girls they bang are upper middle class people who can put on a condom or eat a fucking pill once a day. If birth control disappeared tomorrow and we didn't adjust our behavior upper middle class Chads would be popping out kids left and right.

Kingofdeadbedroom • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 09:19 AM

You're quite possibly missing some of the finer nuances. GENERALLY low income men / welfare dependent men are disadvantaged compared to the higher earning beta bucks because women in the same class get income to cover the cost of children from the government. They just do not need a man for economic reasons, or may quite likely be penalised for having one.

The flip side is that the chads in that socio-economic class can sire as many kids as they like because the Western governments cannot steal their assets or incomes because they have no assets and their low incomes are provided by and/or protected by the government.

In various Western countries, a cunning man should either be amongst the better off, or its just not worth his while working (if he wants to have a family). He might as well just remain on welfare and play it to his advantage, like so many women do.

Reven311[S] • 13 points • 8 May, 2018 11:34 PM

That's too far down the rabbit hole and beyond the scope of this discussion.

bob13bob • 30 points • 8 May, 2018 06:53 PM*

interesting, wonder if we'll return to the 2:1 reproduction ratio rate that's been that way for most human history. I'd like to see this from economic terms. Women in the states are very strongly incentivized to have a richer baby daddy thanks to higher child support.

is this a mental calculation, in violation of a women's old lizard brain to be attracted to strong?

Also, imo gym is a smaller part of the equation than perceived intelligence, which is why college professors have women throwing themselves at them.

Incel9876 • 64 points • 8 May, 2018 07:04 PM

gym is a smaller part of the equation than perceive intelligence, which is why college professors and have women throwing themselves at them.

College profs have women throwing themselves at them, because Beta Bux, women taking the path of least resistance to pass their classes, not because of any perception of intelligence. For women in the military, it is their drill sergeants, for women at work, their bosses.

justtenofusinhere • 42 points • 8 May, 2018 09:21 PM

That's likely only a small part, the larger part is the contextual alpha. The professor is king of his class. He stands up in front and commands all attention, and grants all grades based on his perception of worth. So, he has status, power and ability and all the girls have to cowtow to him giving him instant social proof.

bob13bob • 33 points • 8 May, 2018 07:08 PM*

there is definitely sexual strategy, but it's more than that. IMO women are attracted to power, whether that is physical, mental, or financial strength more than just beta bucks. they like musicians even though that means poor for the most part. women's top fantasies are vampires, werewolves, billionaires, doctors. you don't need to sexually fantasize about a billionaire who has zero chance of taking care of you.

correction/clarification: as peterson states in the link below, women are attracted to people at the top of the dominance hierarchy. most typical google searches for harlequin stories are pirates, werewolves, vampires, surgeons, billionaires.

Troll_Name • 46 points • 8 May, 2018 08:25 PM

Women's sexual strategy is the core of their power strategy.

Men's power strategy is the core of their sexual strategy.

ChadwickChadington • 6 points • 8 May, 2018 07:22 PM

women's top fantasies are vampires, werewolves, billionaires, doctors

Is this a proven thing?

I'm really surprised if it is, but the world is full of surprises.

Proto_Sigma • 15 points • 8 May, 2018 07:38 PM

Right here, bucko.

The link is a video summarizing the findings of the data, but there's another link to the book proper in the description. It's called 'A Billion Wicked Thoughts' and supposedly it summarizes search history of different demographics with regards to porn, amongst other things.

ChadwickChadington • 4 points • 8 May, 2018 08:11 PM

That's really crazy.

I kind of get vampires, especially with all the teen-vampire-soap-operas (though is an effect or the cause I wonder), but werewolves ... very curious.

::Edit:: You forgot pirates.

WarViper1337 • 4 points • 8 May, 2018 09:28 PM

I would imagine the movie series "twilight" made werewolves quite popular. There was a small explosion of werewolf based teen dramas that hit streaming services not long after the twilight movies.

Solitary_Solidarity • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 04:36 AM

But that's not even real, I don't understand.

ThomasHobbesROK • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 01:16 PM

haha - this is actually 100% true. I remember a couple of years ago coming home and opening up my torrents and finding about 20 episodes of something called 'Teen Wolf'. I sat there staring at it for about 2 seconds thinking 'huh - I don't remember downloading that' before remembering I have a younger teenage sister. That was an awkward conversation.

jonlojoie • 1 points • 8 May, 2018 11:33 PM [recovered]

Jordan peterson is a satanic pill pusher-look at voxday's site

PsychedelicDentist • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 08:10 AM

Watch his videos and make up your mind, instead of letting some shit journalist make it for you

jonlojoie • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:06 PM

I listen to the points they make based off of things jp has written or said and I form my opinion. I know I hate him for being a psychiatry pusher/pill pusher. 1) Peterson promotes a bizarre "Darwinian truth" Christianity. 2) Peterson opposes "conspiracy theories". 3) Peterson promotes SSRIs and is hooked on them.

PsychedelicDentist • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 06:05 PM

I dont fully understand what you mean by a 'psychiatry pusher'...if you mean developing a deeper understanding of psychology, I'd strongly disagree.

However on the rest of the points I certainly agree. He got owned in his discussion with Sam harris on the nature of Truth. I also think his need to subscribe to a single religion is total bollocks, but I do appreciate how he can extract truth from it.

Opposing conspiracy theories in this day and age is retarded - fair point

He's too weak to try using psychedelics to sort out his neurological issues even though he is aware of their effectiveness, another fair point

Regardless though, I think he provides a huge amount of value to be gained from listening to him, and as with anyone, they have their flaws.

jonlojoie • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 06:48 PM

He's a limited hangout. He is kind of the definition of honeydicking. Psychiatry is a depop measure and thought policing measure. It is torture. I really would rather die than sit in a room full of people that can not be convinced that forced psychiatry is abusive.

Proto_Sigma • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 03:13 AM

I visited voxday's site, specifically the article on Peterson. I think you are mistaken as to which one is the pill pusher.

jonlojoie • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 05:04 PM

hmm I'll look into it. What did voxday say that makes you think he pushes psychiatry/pills/injections?

Proto_Sigma • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 05:17 PM

Not literally pushing pills so much as being ideologically loaded and pushing an agenda(or metaphorical pill, if you will).

The anti-semitic elements of his criticism was a warning bell immediately as stirring up racial animus of any kind generally is a danger sign. Beyond the fact that very little of what Peterson actually believes or discusses is actually related to the so called 'Jewish Question' (a much greater focus is placed on personal

development and wellbeing, an understanding of archetypes and human cognition as it relates to society, story telling and culture, personality differences and the factors behind the rise of authoritarianism). Calling someone an intellectual fraud because you disagree with them on a single data point on a single issue seems disingenuous.

Furthermore, I'm fairly well acquainted with the literature on IQ myself and know that the evidence for elevated verbal IQ scores amongst Ashkenazi Jews is very substantial and Vox's critique seems flimsy.

I may or may not have read the right article, so I'll link it here for you to correct me, but if this is who you were referring to I must say I am thoroughly unimpressed by this 'Vox Day' character.

financialwar • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 01:34 AM

what the fuck is 2:1 reproduction ratio?

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:22 PM

Genetic evidence suggests the historical gender ratio for successful reproduction was about 80% of women, 40% of men. So 60% of all the men who lived in prehistoric times never reproduced.

Origami84 • 6 points • 8 May, 2018 06:58 PM

Maybe, but only in the short term. While i hope it will take as long as possible, war between major powers will eventually come back. It can be easily imagine what the destruction of the welfare state (due to lack of funds now needed for war operations) and a dramatic reduction in the number of man will reinstate a civilization more similar to that of the last century.

That, or islam will conquer europe - with a forced monogamy for women, that will help in equalize the number of couples.

Hjalmbere • 20 points • 8 May, 2018 08:29 PM

Forced polygamy you mean? And lots of poor dudes who don't get laid and decide to blow themselves up so they can get access to Alan Snackbar's 48 virgins.

Parara_papapapaVeis • 2 points • 8 May, 2018 11:56 PM

Well it really depends from the sect.

bob13bob • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:27 AM

this is silly. military war between major trade powers will never happen. the only winner is the one who's economies don't get destoryed (eg the usa in ww2 dominated because of this). these days wars are fought with cyber hacking, stealing trade secrets and trade wars. military industrial complex wil continue to churn away blwing up poor nations; but it wont touch our money makers.

[deleted] • 48 points • 8 May, 2018 10:08 PM

Don't worry, this is all according to plan, 30 year old Abdullah and the rest of the refugees of peace will be arriving shortly to spread cultural enrichment in the form of gang rape and no go zones! Prepare to meet the 'New Norwegians'.

Unrelenting • 30 points • 8 May, 2018 10:36 PM*

It's the Norwegians' fault for becoming gaping pulsating pussies.

Edit: Women don't like weak men who make concessions to please them. Don't downvote me for stating the truth you retards.

Parara_papapapaVeis • 9 points • 8 May, 2018 11:57 PM

Well they voted for radical feminist to get the power, naturally they got feminized, soon the muslims in Norway will get as well.

Venny_1 • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 12:48 AM

Are you insinuating that muslims are prone to being effected by feminism? Very few of them sure, but that's about it. Muslim communities tend to open closed: open in the sense that they welcome outsiders to step in and get a peek, maybe become part of the community themselves (conversion), yet closed in the sense that they don't allow outside culture/ ideology to compete with theirs, be it in dialog or debate.

Scroober92 • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 02:15 AM [recovered]

When I see **extremely scantily clad** women (shorts literally being cut of inside their thigh gaps) here in Norway they always tend to be middle eastern looking girls.

Islam will be pussified as well eventually.. Its a shame. The middle east really was the last place on earth that rejected consumerism and the female imperative, but even that seems to be changing.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 May, 2018 02:02 PM

When one recognises the vast corrupting forces at work behind the scenes, one shouldn't react in anger toward those who fall prey to it. A great man once said this about Socialism, a builder breaks his back for little pay, and the unions use his bitter resentment for their own aims.

A blue pilld European man is simply a product of a vile and sinister cultural narrative, and while it is pointless to try and save him, your scorn should be directed at the weak philosophy that made him, your kinsman, the pitiable creature he is.

tilnewstuff • -4 points • 9 May, 2018 06:48 AM

Your alarmism is hilarious.

PanderjitSingh • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 01:45 PM

Not happening in your neighborhood? Lucky for you.

iLoveReddit32 • 53 points • 8 May, 2018 10:06 PM

Fuck getting married and fuck having children. No thanks.

miserablesisyphus • 15 points • 9 May, 2018 12:28 AM

Do you mind explaining why you don't want children? To each his own, but i feel one of the low resolution purposes of life is to pass your genes on, if you are worthy.

monkeysword88 • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 02:37 AM [recovered]

He'd probably prefer a hedonistic lifestyle.

iLoveReddit32 • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 02:48 AM

I am depressed and go through bouts of wanting to kill myself. I couldn't leave a possible wife and children with the possibility of living without me. Better to just not get involved. Furthermore, the world is super fucked up and miserable, why bring another human into the world?

miserablesisyphus • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 12:49 PM

In all seriousness, you should get some professional help.

Shaman6624 • 1 point • 13 May, 2018 03:37 PM

Although it's good he doesn't take kids if he's in that state of mind. It's a big responsibility

[deleted] • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 02:51 PM

IMO, I would never have a child unless I could be totally sure I'd have the proper time, effort, and resources to devote to its upbringing.

I think it's immoral to just pop out a kid with no real plan and hope everything turns out okay.

[deleted] • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 01:07 AM

Without kids you have time to accrue certain knowledge that parents don't have the time for, then passing that knowledge on can give a worthwhile purpose.

U-94 • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 03:03 AM

I dislike children and every time I sit on an airplane that point gets hammered home further.

iLoveReddit32 • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 02:48 AM

I am depressed and go through bouts of wanting to kill myself. I couldn't leave a possible wife and children with the possibility of living without me. Better to just not get involved. Furthermore, the world is super fucked up and miserable, why bring another human into the world?

HunterFbukowski • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 09:40 AM

Same sentiment here, on one hand I have the urge biologically to roam around fathering random children, but I also don't want to be involved in the *modern* style of child rearing. I try to keep my contact with the state and other normies to a minimum; having kids throws you right back into that sewer canal of social services which as a mid twenties I've only just got out of really. The thought of subjecting a mini me to the current school system and then going along to parent evenings makes me fucking sick. Taking them to birthday parties and dealing with everyone elses little shits and abominable wives, just fucking no thanks. And before you say, I don't have the sort of money to pay for private tuition and so forth.

A child is not the only impact you leave on this Earth. Take Shakespeare. He has no living descendants, although he did have children. Fat lot of good they did in continuing the line! Ultimately the sun will explode and noone will remember anything you did anyway, so why drastically lower the quality of this one life you have just to follow some delusional lineage dream?

Ultimately society has made fathering children a bad choice, and society must pay for this in a meta sense by having its best and strongest males refusing to marry and reproduce, otherwise you're just an enabler.

amedeo_modigliani • 8 points • 9 May, 2018 12:05 AM

Good. Lesson 2: Fuck LTR and fuck living with a woman.

7mile_ • -1 points • 9 May, 2018 05:42 PM

Hedonistic coward. You are afraid of having kids and feeling the pain life has to offer. You are committing genetic suicide, because you are too afraid to conquer the problems in front of you.

iLoveReddit32 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 06:03 PM

interesting take. Having children creates problems that I don't need to deal with. Why would I invite more problems into my life? Why would I want to continue on my genetic pre-disposition to depression onto someone else? Let me guess, you have children?

7mile_ • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 08:02 PM

Nope but at some point I want to

iLoveReddit32 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 08:37 PM

Come back to this thread when your child is 1 year old, keeping you awake at night, and has your wife/partner just as miserable as you are. And after you have spent a shitload of money on the kid. Then we'll see how you feel.

[deleted] • 13 points • 9 May, 2018 01:50 AM*

Great post. There's one quality post like this that actually teaches us stuff for every 100 "pulled a number at the gym" stories.

The more power women get, the more fucked we are. The primary foundation of all civilization is men agreeing to take one wife so that everyone can reproduce. Unrestrained female sexuality leads inexorably to harems and the collapse of motivation to maintain the civilization. Men are civilization. Women are just here for the ride.

Reven311[S] • 6 points • 9 May, 2018 01:55 AM

Thank you. This is why feminists are not opposed to millions of Muslim immigrants who want to keep women under control. They are shit testing the beta men that are going along with this, and finding them unworthy of reproduction, so society collapses and/or gets replaced by masculine men who put feminists in their place again.

[deleted] • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 08:24 AM

Well said.

The reason betas even exist is because even though they lose against alpha chad one in one in sexual competition, beta heavy societies crush societies where sexual selection is more r-selection, harems, and polygamy.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 02:53 PM

Yep. Nothing motivates a man to work more than the promise of being rewarded some pussy in the end.

ROLLTIDE4EVER • 4 points • 8 May, 2018 10:39 PM

The Ballad of Mt. Naryama mentions of sexless men who were basically at the bottom of societal totem pole. This was in pre-modern Japan.

The_Chiselator • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 05:25 AM

The paper literally writes itself. This is not good. Because the only reason betas go to work their three shit jobs for 18 hours a day is because they were promised a woman by the Patriarchy if only they keep their heads down, work hard and don't upset the system.

Fucking with the world's betas (as is happening everywhere) is counter-productive. Who is going to do your taxes? Dig your ditches? Mine your coal? keep your books? Buy your football jerseys?

You see, women being the perpetual victims they are think that patriarchy was designed to oppress them. It was actually intended to help Betas make up for what they lack in personality/physique/temperament and elevate their other qualities so that they can pair up with an average woman, have a couple of kids and society thrives.

Now you have feral women who can't shag Billy the Beta at least so that he can continue building the next app/gadgetry.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:43 PM

Women's reproductive criteria are so primitive that the only way to maintain civilization in the long run is via some level of oppression. This is unfortunate, because we were all taught to love freedom, but it's a lie. Freedom is just chaos without some level of social control.

victordmor • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 03:35 PM

And we keep going downhill, fellas. Brace yourselves.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:09 PM

<https://imgflip.com/i/1yqnyi>

Rian_Stone • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 06:45 PM

I jokingly called this a "crowd sourced modern eugenics program."

The most I see, the less of a joke it seems to be.

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 09:49 PM

Eugenics is just positive evolution, but regression is possible via dysgenics too.

ItsCold_ItsCold • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 07:22 AM

TL;DR More and more women are entering harems with Chads and taking turns having their babies.

redpilledcuck • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 08:45 AM*

Women are nature's breeding vats and to some degree selection filter. Men are nature's genetic experimental testing ground, where she can go wild and free with new configurations that can either fuck up badly or be wildly successful. Since it only takes 1 dick to impregnate 99 wombs rather than the other way around, you can extrapolate what this means for women and successful males.

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 02:45 PM

Yes, precisely correct, but this breeding style destroys civilizations if left unchecked by men who build civilizations.

wanderer779 • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 12:31 PM

The basic argument is that the bar is being raised for men to have mating rights. You'd think that should be a good thing for society. But there's a few problems:

1. The bar isn't being raised for women. Wouldn't it do even more to raise the quality of our stock if we also had some sort of competitive pressure on women?
2. The women are doing the selecting and they suck at it. Women aren't attracted to intelligence, otherwise the robotics club dudes would be drowning in pussy while the football team sat at home jacking off. Instead women just keep chasing tall handsome dudes. When it comes to mate selection software, they're still running version 1.0 from 10,000 years ago. Men naturally are dancing to the tune the women are calling. Look at the advice here, it's mostly peacocking. Not knocking it, it works for getting laid, but I can't say that it's the most pro-social program we could have come up with.
3. What are we going to do with all these men? VR porn, video games? Remove the stigma for suicide? What if that doesn't work? Drum up another war every generation to kill them off? So far we've tried ignoring them, and lecturing them about being nice (as if that was going to work) and now it looks like plan b is going to be insulting and belittling them. Not sure what that's going to do, but it seems to be the approach we're going towards.

Reven311[S] • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 02:51 PM

Women's sexual selection is still programmed like we all live in caves and hunt and gather fruit from trees every day to survive. That's the depth of their selection criteria, and it's inherently destructive to civilizations, which is why men built concepts like monogamy and disallowed sex before marriage to ensure beta males had access to sex which encourage social stability and productivity.

wanderer779 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 08:53 PM

Yeah, having men pass tests for fitness before mating is probably a good thing, but the tests are all wrong. To be fair we don't have much room to talk, cause we are attracted to looks more than intelligence. But I don't know that it matters as much cause it seems all the girls are going to have the chance to reproduce anyway.

Anyway it seems right now that we're not doing much to improve our stock. Maybe humans shouldn't be bred like animals, after all we've been letting all the idiots reproduce for quite a while now and things keep advancing. But one would think we could progress a hell of a lot faster if we got some sort of system that at least halfway pointed us in a direction towards progress. Maybe the geneticists will figure something out.

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 09:47 PM

Yea I'm not saying men are perfect, but men don't destroy civilization when they chase pretty girls.

danielj61373 • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 01:46 PM

"Females have re-established a sexual dynamic via education and birth control that favors their reproductive strategies again after centuries of repression." Finally an evolutionary psychology based answer to this modern cultural shift

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:53 PM

Female's brains still think we all live in caves and go out each day to hunt meat and gather fruit to eat each day to survive. Women are programmed to destroy civilization if they are allowed to fully express their sexuality without some form of social control mechanism, like those created in the Bible via Christianity.

1v1crown • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 05:27 PM

At one point in human history it was 1 father for 17 mothers. The alpha/beta dynamic seen in animals such as

lions is very strong in humans. The only reason we see birth rates by both men/women in similar numbers now is because we created an artificial and sterile environment where anyone can get lucky and have sex. If this crumbles, we will go back to increased alpha/beta dynamics and female hypergamy will go further unchecked, with the females clamoring for the attention of the top alpha male in droves.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 05:33 PM

That was only during a very short period of time during human history when we were making the transition from being nomads to agriculturalists fixed in a single spot for prolonged periods. No one knows precisely what drove the ratio that high, but it's safe to assume it wasn't 100% hypergamy. People like Genghis Khan roamed the Earth raping and impregnating so many women his genetic trace is still found in many millions of people today. Men at the top of the hierarchy created Christianity and other religions to control female hypergamy and promote social stability and economic development which enabled civilizations to rise and improve living standards for all people.

xXxsabelmannXx • 3 points • 28 May, 2018 08:32 PM

Norwegian here. The women here are also very slutty, in their high school years they fuck around with all the local chads before they move to the cities to study, at this point they are already affected by alpha widow syndrome. I personally think this is the main reason we see so many beta males not having sex and children here. Also, most of the beta males are pretty blue pill who doesn't understand women at all, all a result of our society push to make masculinity seem like a unfavourable trait and a negative view of men in general - men should act more like women is the mantra. And it all boils down to socialism, the root of decay of any society.

Reven311[S] • 0 points • 29 May, 2018 07:15 AM

Feminism, atheism, and socialism is the root of the decay, yes. It's absolutely insane that the colleges in Norway are close to 60% female students. All these fucking women want a college educated husband someday due to hypergamy, so it's a gigantic shitstorm of unprecedented proportions.

Nergaal • 4 points • 8 May, 2018 10:16 PM*

You have it all wrong. WHEN agriculture was invented, a single male would have offsprings for every 30-17 females with offsprings. That means that only 6% of males had viable offsprings (that had kids who further had kids and didn't die of starvation). That was a huge driving force for evolution when agriculture was invented. TBH, I would not be surprised if most of population differences today occur because in certain parts of the world, agriculture, and women-driven selection has been happening since earlier, and thus, has lead to average individuals today with [inset_phenotype] that are present in certain parts.

Christianity only in the past 2k years has advocated monogamy and made sure that most males get offsprings. With the averages from before, only like 40% of males who ever lived have left offsprings today, while for women is like 80%.

edit: chimps and apparently earlier human societies were very socialistic in their setup; agriculture enabled the competence hierarchy to dominate any other hierarchy, which led to human society greatly changing in the past 8k years compared to any other period Homo Sapiens and its interbreeding cousins have existed. COmpetence hierarchy means if you are a male who can sustain 17 females, all those females will instinctually (from natural selection of their ancestors) flock to you.

turpin23 • 5 points • 8 May, 2018 11:09 PM

You're confusing the odd, rare massive military conquest with the typical situation.

bob13bob • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 12:29 AM

that 17:1 one period there is a lot of unknowns on why that happened, only speculation. IT only happened during a very short period. could have been a disease that wiped out 90% of men for all we know.

antidoxdevice • 1 point • 12 May, 2018 08:58 PM

Then it would also have wiped out 90% of women.

jethreezy • 1 point • 12 May, 2018 10:24 PM

It's not baseless speculation though. The timing (4-8kya) fits well with the advent and spread of agriculture, which only begun ~10kya.

Nergaal • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 04:44 AM

That's the most blue pill deflection I've seen on this sub ever.

dr_warlock • 6 points • 8 May, 2018 11:57 PM

That's because polygamy was the norm for most of human history (as many as you could afford). Pre-agricultural conditions just made it limited because of the 'resource ceiling' from hunting and gathering. When agriculture came about, it lifted the 'resource ceiling' allowing for the SAME top men to accumulate more women and more children from each. Old men at the top hoarded tons of women as they each reached puberty, adding to their harem throughout their whole life-time, kicking out the boys once they became a sexual threat. That's devastating to the gene pool.

Nergaal • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 04:45 AM

That's devastating to the gene pool.

And perfectly great for artificial selection

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 02:27 PM

And their farms were probably burnt down by thousands of men who became roaming warlords.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:21 AM

Its unlikely betas with no women became roaming warlords. The roaming warlords were the alphas that could get women fairly easily as their 'outlaw' status and their ability to make kings tremble was very alluring.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:23 AM

No, they join armies or organized gangs lead by tyrants that would rather steal wealth than create it with productive work. Genghis Khan raped a lot of women in his day, but it's safe to say every time his army sacked a town his men raped all the women as well.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:30 AM

No, they join armies or organized gangs lead by tyrants that would rather steal wealth than create it with productive work

By stealing wealth they can then use that wealth to create and get soft with time themselves, leading them to be overthrown by strong, ambitious and aggressive men.

Genghis Khan would sack cities and raped the women (many of these women would join his

army as camp whores or become on of many wives for his soldiers) but keep the craftsmen and scientists and press them into service - so that they could create more for him and to increase the effectiveness of his war machine.

Warlords are a form of natural selection - they weed out and destroy weak rulers and make their own dynasty until they become weak themselves and get replaced.

sky_fallen • 1 points • 8 May, 2018 10:46 PM [recovered]

That's not what we're told , got a source for the start of agriculture?

Nergaal • 4 points • 8 May, 2018 10:54 PM

<https://psmag.com/environment/17-to-1-reproductive-success>

Apparently it was 17-to-1 only. Not sure why I recalled 30-1.

jethreezy • 1 point • 12 May, 2018 10:20 PM

Yes, there's good evidence that hunter-gatherer societies were more egalitarian than agricultural ones.

chinawinsworlds • 7 points • 8 May, 2018 09:42 PM

Norwegian here, I don't want kids. Want to get a vasectomy, but I'm too young and the doctors here are not kind enough to make an exception. Considering Germany.

b0utch • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 11:51 AM [recovered]

Why are you on this sub then???

chinawinsworlds • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 11:54 AM

This is trp, yes? Self improvement and sexual strategy? General modern politics once in a while? This sub has nothing to do with kids. It's a topic once in a while, sure, but it's not why we're here.

CasaDeFranco • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:47 PM

This is why Europe is dying.

chinawinsworlds • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 01:08 PM

Why give a shit? I won't even live long enough to have to care about such bullshit.

CasaDeFranco • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 01:12 PM

Because as a man we hold the burden of civilisation on our shoulders. Your nation, your extended family's culture will be deracinated, and the civilisation your forefathers built will be destroyed.

If this doesn't concern you, please then by all means do not procreate.

chinawinsworlds • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 01:14 PM

Such trivialities we humans manage to cook up... nothing matters, so I will live as I want. I'm not gonna waste my good mental health thinking about bullshit all day. My country will be Muslim some years after I die I guess, and I couldn't care less - I'll be gone from existence forever.

CasaDeFranco • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:17 PM

Good, I look forward to your removal from the gene pool.

In the meanwhile I'll have as many children as one can sustainably.

The future belongs to the people who inherit it.

chinawinsworlds • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:18 PM

Yes, and who gives a shit? You think this will somehow change anything? You'll still die, I'll die and nothing you and I did will matter in any way. I'm not out of the gene pool, my family lives strong. I just won't spend time getting kids.

CasaDeFranco • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:23 PM

History is the autobiography of great men.

I'm 28, I've served in the military, deployed alongside Norwegians in ISAF, created my own company, invented and patented new technologies.

I intend on making a difference before I die. Children extend my legacy and continue it.

You have no meaning and see none in beyond your life. I can't convince you to be a man of reason when you are so myopic.

No further responses are required, this conversation is over because I am speaking to a dead man.

chinawinsworlds • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:30 PM

You can continue putting effort into meaningless things, and your brain has to give you motivation to do these things somehow of course - that's why you can't easily accept that they change nothing. Not my problem. You're not a man of reason.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:34 PM

You are lost my friend, reject nihilism and hedonism, embrace God and read Jordan Peterson's book and watch his youtubes.

chinawinsworlds • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:41 PM

lol.....

I'm not gonna embrace something that simply does not exist. No god, no worship. Sorry, not sorry! I love Jordan though.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:14 PM

Even if God doesn't exist, it's in your best interests to be brainwashed to believe he does. You may be lost, but it's important for children to be convinced God exists, because atheism leads to the slow destruction of civilization.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:33 PM

You can't get through to people like this, they're consumed by nihilism and postmodernism.

Nothing really matters in life to them beyond their own pleasure and hedonistic motivations. It's sad, but that's what happens without the influence of a higher power in people's lives.

The_Chiselator • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 03:37 PM

Good. This is what the Vikings have become. Look at how low they have sunk.

ColonelGray • -1 points • 8 May, 2018 10:19 PM

Good on you! 7.6 billion of us on earth already it's time to slow down on the sheer number of children we're vomiting out.

[deleted] • 15 points • 8 May, 2018 11:48 PM

That's right goy, stop having kids. Let the Arabs have the kids for you, and make sure you give them the right to vote!

ColonelGray • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 07:52 AM

Don't be obtuse. We live on a planet of finite resources. Food, gas, coal, oil, living space etc.

Why do you assume that I want people of any race to overbreed? If we all try go out breed each other it's just a race to the bottom.

This has nothing to do with being a 'soy' it's purely numbers.

Bring on the downvotes, my dudes.

b0utch • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 11:53 AM

Let the low IQ take over... All population problem will be solved when nobody cares about the issue? We aren't limited to this planet...

ColonelGray • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 02:33 PM

Not limited to this planet?

Tell you what you can go on ship B then.

We may colonise other planets in the future (if we don't nuke ourselves into oblivion first) but there will never be a mass migration, it would never be feasible.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:35 PM

He said goy, not soy.... lol.

ColonelGray • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 11:21 PM

Honestly not too fussed. The guy was moronic.

chinawinsworlds • 4 points • 8 May, 2018 10:20 PM

Life is too good here to waste my time on kids.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:35 PM

Classic nihilism and hedonism, sad.

solstone109 • 2 points • 8 May, 2018 10:04 PM

I don't understand the wording of the last paragraph of OP's post. Can someone explain it to me like I'm 5?

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 May, 2018 11:43 PM*

I think OP's characterization of the shift is anachronistic (i.e. it isn't "re-establishing" some primordial matriarchal paradigm). When a social animal has unlimited resources and no predators it degenerates into full dysgenics until it collapses, removing the security of unlimited resources/no predators (nature or enemies) and men re-establish dominance by being the source of security. This quickly culls the useless men

and disobedient women who refuse to fall into the new pecking order. Transgender/homosexuality, liberal sexuality, low marriage rates, single motherhood, open borders immigration, destruction of national heroes/language are all typical symptoms of a system in collapse.

This is a cyclical process of collapse that has happened in literally every empire to exist. Nature isn't dumb. It's just brutal.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:29 PM

Yes feminism in the Roman Empire was a thing, and sexual deviance with homosexuals was very big towards the end. Illegal immigration and slavery lowered men's incomes so they couldn't reproduce.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:10 PM

We're on the same page. I interpreted your statement to suggest that patriarchy was 'the' de facto state of nature. Which is what I was disagreeing with. If that's not what you meant, then I misunderstood.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:28 PM

Women have never controlled society, but they do tend to dominate the sexual marketplace in all environments, as the primary selectors of men for mating, as long as they're in a social setting that prohibits rape and punishes it accordingly (which is not always true in times of war/chaos).

Women have to be kept in their place otherwise they will drag us back down toward the stone age their reproductive system is selected for thriving in.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 8 May, 2018 11:23 PM

I wish I could explain it in simpler terms, but that's the best I can do.

solstone109 • 0 points • 8 May, 2018 11:46 PM

Ohh so in old times if you couldn't hunt and provide you wouldn't get any pussy. But with agriculture and technology that wasn't the case anymore so natural sex selection was all over the place. Now in Norway a researcher is seeing a resurgence of the old model.

zaparans • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 12:35 AM

So essentially there is no need for red pill beta males. Shocking.

kejflk34jlkd • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 03:24 AM **[recovered]**

I want kids, but I'm waiting to find a girl who isn't a complete whore, so it probably will never happen.

Reven311[S] • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 03:27 AM

Find a woman in Hungary or Poland, go on vacation there, don't use a service.

FANATICAL_ • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 06:07 AM

A lot of comments are correlating childless guys with incels when if it's anywhere like where I live, there's lots of girls who want kids but can't find a guy who can be bothered. Most guys are chadding it up in hookup culture and are not trying to form families. So the women who want one are just picking guys with track record of happily paying child support. I could have had kids with 20+ women had I chosen to put the "let's have kids" moves on them but I prefer a very high income and a soft harem with variety. I'm not some exception, consider every girl you've dated and you'll have a couple you know would have happily been your baby momma...

MrQinDang • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 12:07 PM [recovered]

It's funny, these studies are about WHITE men in Norway, but it fails to mention that tidbit.

I know why, Norwegian society is very Feminist and has been emasculated for quite some time. It's a combination of their culture being submissive and such (not looking anyone in the eye, firm handshakes, rough beards etc), low birth whites among White women and a love of getting cucked.

They need to bring in shitskin immigrants from shithole countries to do the same they can't do because (((they))) have put something in the water... which is turning all the men in Norway into little bitches.

Reven311[S] • 4 points • 9 May, 2018 02:48 PM

Feminism is a shit test on whether society deserves to survive or not and/or be replaced by anti-feminist cultures and masculine men from more primitive lands and cultures that will tear down and destroy everything their fathers and grandfathers built for them.

MrQinDang • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 04:33 PM [recovered]

Precisely brother.

Women must be kept in check, these immigrants need to be sent back, we need strong borders, we need to preserve our cultural heritage.

Reven311[S] • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 04:41 PM

Stay strong and keep supporting politicians like Trump and we might just achieve that someday.

VanityKings • 2 points • 10 May, 2018 02:27 PM

I'm more and more entertaining the idea of paying an attractive and healthy woman to carry my child but to also have her remove herself entirely from the child's life as soon as it is born.

Probably going to go this route if I ever get wealthy enough to make it happen

BroMuch • 8 points • 8 May, 2018 10:11 PM

I love redpill but I not everything has to do with redpill. I believe this has to do with developed nations. Poorer nations have higher birthrates then developed nations, that's a no brainier.

Even in the US we have seen a decline in birthrates, and when you see a poorer nations, third world countries, become more developed their birthrates will decline and equalize.

It's a biological emparative to reproduce in times when there is uncertianty that your children will survive. Just look at England during the industrial revolution.

Every species has this. For example, Mice and bats have similar metabolism but the life span of a bat far out weighs that of a rat, because there are no real predititors of bats there is no need to have an urgency to reproduce, and their biology can focus more on life expectancy.

I don't believe redpill is at work here bruh

tux68 • 3 points • 8 May, 2018 10:14 PM

As long as women are picking the strongest and best males to reproduce, wont this problem take care of itself in a few generations? The weakest males wont reproduce but future generations will be comprised of stronger seed so to speak. Unless I'm missing something.

zaparans • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 12:36 AM

Women are picking the strongest and best males to reproduce and they aren't beta male red pill dbags

tux68 • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 03:50 AM*

Yeah, a success in Red Pill is inherently self limiting in an evolutionary sense. The guys most inclined to follow it will not be reproducing offspring of similar temperament.

Edit: I guess this would apply more to MGTOW than Red Pill, although I saw quite a few RP saying "hell no" to marriage and children.

Rene-Girard • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 03:18 AM [recovered]

Yes, you're missing something. Women in Niger have more than 6 children on average. Is the genes of the Nigerian man 4 times stronger than the genes of the Norwegian man?

tux68 • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 03:54 AM

Well granted it's tremendously complex. The mortality rate for offspring in Niger is a lot higher, so there won't be 6 successful reproducing offspring on average. But really the main point is, only people who are able to attract a mate will be reproducing, which should decrease the pool of unattractive mates in future generations within any given community.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:36 PM

For their environment the genes in Nigeria are fine, but unfortunately they don't select for high intelligence necessary to function in an advanced society.

merkucjo • 1 point • 8 May, 2018 10:34 PM

What is percentage of gay people in Norway ? Should be excluded so math is correct

Reven311[S] • 3 points • 8 May, 2018 11:36 PM

There's about equal gays vs lesbians, so it doesn't matter, it balances out on both sides.

Johnnyvile • 1 point • 8 May, 2018 11:19 PM

I'm reading the detail of the men that are having children are the ones that already have children in 2 ways. One being those men already decided they want children vs many men that want children but don't want children yet/right now. Most people have children close together, even after a divorce when they meet a new person.

Second, a woman would likely chose a man that already has kids because he has already adapted his life to taking care of children, being responsible and dependent. That's a good choice instead of the 20-30 year old guy that likes to go out all the time and hang with the bros, blow his money on himself, or entirely focus on his career. Also if a man they are dating already has kids then they have a good idea of what type of father he is, shitty or great, so I assume they would be more inclined to choose someone they can actually witness already being a good father.

sighkalopsia • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:10 AM

What if we're looking at this all wrong and the 25% are the alphas?

The article said recycled men? To me mostly a beta would fall into that due to their inability to recognize the game, right? And the fact women know they can ditch a dude that isn't respectable...

What alpha would get into a marriage and realize they fucked up then leave it? None cause they don't fall for the tyranny of feminism that most women in-licit, daily. Alpha uses that and the social standard to their advantage, right?

Reven311[S] • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 12:14 AM

I somehow doubt this, but if that's true then alphas are an endangered species in Norway. Women in Norway seem to be highly selecting for beta and alpha characteristics. Being purely alpha with no money or purely beta bucks with no natural attractiveness is not enough for them to stop taking contraception and intentionally reproduce.

CaptPic4rd • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 12:49 AM

25% of men are not alphas lol. Try like less than 1%.

sighkalopsia • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:58 AM

I had high hopes. Dumb of me to think so ☐☐♂☐

sighkalopsia • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:17 AM

I feel yah boss. Figured alpha standard was to be like “wrap it up or birth control pills” on the reg. But your argument is a valid one, indeed!

SILENTSAM69 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:47 AM

This is crazy to think about when it comes to how the Y chromosome is handed down.

Meisner1 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:10 AM

Please reclarify on the conclusion. Is religion promoting monogamy going to make the situation worse or better? Is through religion that beta males are being red pillled?

Reven311[S] • 5 points • 9 May, 2018 01:30 AM

Religious monogamy is the only sustainable mode of reproduction proven to work for thousands of years of civilization building. This means women need to obey their husbands and all that stuff they rail against when they talk about the patriarchy. Patriarchal systems are necessary to spread the sexual wealth to lower cast betas to ensure you extract maximum productivity out of the male population, the population does not decline towards collapse, and societal stability is maintained.

Meisner1 • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 01:33 AM

Wow, ok i get it now. Thanks dude.

So. Sadly what is happening right now is that woman is going against what should be the right way...

Reven311[S] • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 02:39 PM

Women will always destroy civilization if men allow it, and sadly that is going to continue until enough masculine men stand up and say no more. Right now the masculine men don't care because to them life is meaningless due to their belief there is no God or afterlife. So they have embraced nihilism and hedonism to fill the void in their souls.

Meisner1 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 03:46 PM

Even then, i dont think there is enough masculine men in this day and age.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:06 PM

Men will rise to the occasion if there is a perceived need for men to be masculine again, but right now there is no incentive.

andreas-mgtow • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:40 AM

When women do give birth to children, it turns out that it can often be with men who have kids from previous relationships.

Some working class men choose not to have children. Others are simply not found sufficiently attractive by women.

"When Norwegian men from the working class have children, it is more often by chance," explains Jensen.

Hold on, wouldn't this point towards financially successful men enjoying a higher reproductive success rate?

From her research, it seems to follow that women are recycling men who are most able to provide for their offspring and that these men know that they have the upperhand and engage in serial monogamy.

This seems to contradict the idea that SMV in Norway favors Chads, but instead financials trump other factors.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:38 PM

It's both, white women especially want a mix of alpha/beta (attractive and provisioning), but these men are rare.

Siskiyou • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:50 AM

Those men should go to Eastern Europe to meet women if they can.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:37 PM

They're often too foolish to figure it out.

lister777 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 05:08 AM

Wow wow. Jumping to conclusions so fast is a bit stupid. For monogamy, there is a dimension of violence that is underlying: violence is expensive for everyone. For the rise in %, there are clear incentive in place for men not to have children, even when they want. How many "alpha" here have children or want children? This either contradicts the "beta" conclusion, either the "alpha genes" concept here. Add to this the rise of homosexuality as the cherry of cultural marxism. Last, before saying that we are in an equalitarian society, one should look at fact. The traditional Christian society was MUCH MORE equal than today. We live in a total lie, from a to z. Equal society... my ass yeah! The conclusion to take from this is that there is a clear problem in today's society. These researchers are a bit stupid. They ask the wrong questions, look for the wrong facts and reach limping conclusions. Well, a feminized society without much logic nor directions in a nutshell.

throwitdownman • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 05:56 AM

Damn. Do they not divorce rape / common law marriage in Norway? Yet the article says they have strong rights for women there? If I have a baby with a chick I know half my net worth is at risk, and that number increases with more kids.

If I could have kids with no consequences I'll be spreading my seed like crazy as well.

Fedor_Gavnyukov • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 07:27 AM

about 25% of the male population is simply obsolete

in times of war a lot of men would simply die off as well.. now, that there is peace, they don't die off, but there are other ways to make them obsolete

neso225 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 08:56 AM

It's not just Norway my friend a lot of developed countries have problems with reproduction. The thing with other western countries for example Germany they have a lot of muslims mainly Syria who work there and reproduce like rats and that's why they don't have low reproductive statistics as Norway.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 11:10 AM

In the seventies the Rockefeller started organisation population council (previously named eugenicist society) did a brainstorm how to reduce population growth.

Increasing income and education for women was one of the ways that came out of that brainstorm.

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 02:47 PM

Too bad it had the unintended consequence of collapsing civilization entirely. If you start pulling on threads that create a great tapestry of civilization for thousands of years, you're bound to run into problems. Now we just have population replacement by primitive cultures like Muslims who will accelerate our decline to final collapse like the Romans.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:59 PM*

Good point.

unintended

Yeah, I don't think it's unintended, though.

You can't have a revolution unless you destroy all present structures first. So anyone who wants a revolution, whether you are a marxist, a muslim or other malcontent, if you want to deeply reshape nations, the first step for an irresponsible tyrant is to break it all down.

Besides the unintended bit though; you're spot on.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:03 PM

It's unintentional because they're too stupid/ignorant to realize non-white/asian people are intellectually deficient and always will be. Their solution to population collapse is immigration of cultures and people who will never replace the people who were never born in Western societies. That's the final red pill to swallow. But most people are not ready to face that reality.

Kinbaku_enthusiast • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:09 PM

I wouldn't call asian people intellectually deficient, unless you're using "asian" as british media does as placeholder for "pakistani muslim".

After all, Japan only took in 53 Syrian refugees. And then two were involved in a gang rape, so I doubt they'll be taking more, because they have no issue at being regarded as "racist", because they love and want to protect their culture and people.

Btw, do you mean "could never replace"? Because as things are going, they are replacing people in the West, much as the Zulu's have in South Africa.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:29 PM

Eastern Asian people are smarter than whites in general, so no, I don't mean them.

luciagarcia8818 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:32 PM

"Improved rights have made life easier for parents in Norway, but for women in particular". Well, that is because women had less rights and men were less affected by a lack of rights. So the changes that egalitarianism brings affect the negatively impacted more than those that are already well. This does not seem Red Pill.

"Men have always been the disposable gender" - Not true. Not when a man could divorce a woman at its leisure in western society, women could be sold like goods in eastern society and generally had less rights than men.

And besides what is your solution to the problem? Return to a state of inequality between sexes so women are in a situation in which they have to select men who they would not want if they had the same rights?

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:19 PM

You're still stuck in the Matrix my friend, I don't have time to explain it to you in detail though.

fromthecrypt8 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:52 PM

Actually, the top percentages need that bottom 25 %, because if you removed the latter, competition would «reset» among that remaining top 75 %. That is just my hypothesis. Also adding that a bunch of mediocre men will make those who are slightly above average stand out even more than they would otherwise.

But the women don't need them of course. So many men are not even visible to women. They're like air.

To sum it all up, women are overly picky and self-entitled, expecting way too much of men compared to what they themselves bring to the table - all by way of having that mighty powerful vag and taytays. This entitlement only grows proportionally with the amount of focus feminism and «equality» has in a given society.

MattyAnon • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:35 PM

Females have re-established a sexual dynamic via education and birth control that favors their reproductive strategies again after centuries of repression.

You say "centuries of repression", I say "centuries of SUPPORT". Men supported women (for life) at a time when women had many children (high infant mortality rate). Raising enough children to maintain the population used to require 20 years of maternal care per woman. Men and women legally bonded through marriage. Men SUPPORTED women.

This was not repression, this was a system optimised to raise enough children that a few would survive at a time when clothes were expensive, food was expensive, schooling was limited and many children died young. Motherhood used to last 20 years, not the 3 it does now.

Men of today don't have to somehow repay some mythical repression of yesteryear. If anyone owes anything then it is women that owe men for our sacrifice - not that the world will ever see it that way.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:55 PM

That's true it wasn't 100% repression, and was for their own good, even if they don't agree. It's like a child being guided by a parent, so the patriarchy is like the parent in this case. But their natural sexual drive must be repressed by patriarchy, the reward is a loyal beta for every woman who will happily provide for his family.

MattyAnon • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 06:11 PM

so the patriarchy is like the parent in this case

The patriarchy is exactly like a parent: they ignore the support and complain about what they see as the repression. Like a child ignoring the free food and complaining about having to clean their room.

the reward is a loyal beta for every woman who will happily provide for his family.

Right.

They don't like this deal though, and thus they've destroyed marriage (not that it was ever a good deal for men). Only women could believe that every woman can have a top 1% man all to themselves.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 09:50 PM

They're gonna dislike the collapse of Western civilization a lot worse.

deeze6 • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:41 PM

TL;DR, The Chads of Norway are spreading their seed while the rest of men become incels. Moral of the story: Be Chad

RaughKee • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 01:43 PM

Of course I would have to see all the data and analyze it, but my first thought is...

Why have a child with a beta provider when you can have Chad's baby and the state will step in to play the beta provider role? This is really a dark portent for the majority of men, who were never able to generate the excitement and tingles but were solid family providers.

RuleZeroDAD • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 03:04 PM

Hypergamy doesn't give a fuck

If either completely dependent on a small subset of men for survival, or given a massive social safety net where sex becomes a "choice," women's hypergamous nature demands they seek the "better" men.

Women feign disgust to sharing or being one of many to a man seen as "high quality," but the statistics has always born out the innate desire to "partner up," whether "up" is defined by raw attractiveness (AF), or need of provisioning (BB).

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:12 PM

In the modern world they want both, but both rarely come in an "agreeable" package that's willing to be exploited to the degree they would prefer. So this constant harping about the bogus wage gap is a way to extract more resources out of beta men/society so they can continue to fuck alphas without economic consequence.

RuleZeroDAD • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 04:17 PM

True equality would entail paying everyone the same for the same work, while simultaneously revising the family courts, and social programs to provide identical benefits for men and women. Currently, many of these programs are what are referred to as WIC "Women, Infants, and Children." Notice who are not eligible.

A man, whether it's Big Brother, or a simp plow horse, has the burden of performance to pay for, protect, and placate women and offspring.

Equality in outcomes will never be a reality under this M'lady system.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:25 PM

So Communism is your solution? The free market is incredibly efficient at rewarding people for the actual value of their work. I may be misunderstanding you though.

Hierarchical structures are not the problem, it's absolute freedom with no social constraints on

people's more animalistic and primitive tendencies. Along with no belief in God which leads to nihilistic and hedonistic lifestyle choices. But that's a bit beyond the scope of this post.

RuleZeroDAD • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:48 PM

No, communism is not a solution. The whole equality through regulation thing is a canard. Women would never go for what I proposed, even though it is "more equal" than the current fucked up system. Fact is, they want advantages and safety, not the uncertainty real freedom brings.

Men and women not being equal is the natural state of things. I propose an minarchist view of government, where the state is very limited in its ability to encroach on the individual's right to be left alone.

leftajar • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 08:54 PM

This is not totally accurate: the bottom 25% of men are still needed for tax revenue, which the government will borrow against to prop up the system.

Modern Feminism is a coercively-funded goverent program.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 09:45 PM

They're not contributing much, if they were women would find their incomes more desirable.

starbirth • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 05:41 AM

I chatted to a RP guy from Norway while travelling who was telling me about the insanely high cost of living in Norway (due to highly paid workers in oil industry inflating prices I believe). He can only afford to have "big nights in the city" a few of times a year.

I'd suggest that the extremely high cost of living (incl. housing prices) - as opposed to ideological reasons - are why less low-income men are having kids.

Norweigan women would be smart to select moderate-to-high income earners to have kids with who can support them and their children in the major cities. And these men get recycled.

I'm surprised though that the men are still as likely to want kids. I assumed that low-to-moderate income earning men would also want to avoid the financial liability of having kids in such an economic environment - I live in Sydney where cost of living is also v. high and can completely sympathise with that way of thinking.

(Edit - some typos)

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 06:28 PM

The problem is women make too much money relative to men. 60% of college students are women. That is unsustainable in the long run, which requires muslim immigration to sustain the welfare state, but that will not prevent the eventual collapse, it will just delay the inevitable collapse of the socialistic matriarchal ponzi scheme.

maplemaximus • 1 point • 12 May, 2018 04:52 PM

Scandinavian men are jokes.

tolerantman • 1 point • 14 May, 2018 03:36 PM

Norwegian bitches do not want beta dick but they sure as hell want their money, using big dad government to tax them to death and give it to them.

rockstarsheep • 1 point • 20 May, 2018 03:25 PM

It might appear that the OP cherry picked quotes to pull out and focus on here, and looking at the resulting comments, it seems that this was a successful strategy to follow. What's this all about?

Well, how about this from the article:

“Couples are constantly finding new reasons to delay a pregnancy. Men especially. There are so many things that have to be done or experienced before starting off. So one day the woman and the man split up, without children.”

“Numerous studies also indicate that women are more intent on having children sometime in their lives than men are,” says Jensen.

As their biological clocks approach the age of infertility, women are eager to have children. But many men still entertain doubts; they procrastinate, and end up childless.

The rest of the article is pretty interesting. Thanks for sharing.

WholesomeAwesome • 1 point • 22 May, 2018 02:01 AM

> get recycled

hmmm. What does this mean? What kind of horrible euphemism is this?

tempolaca • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:16 AM

>. But our modern world simply doesn't need the bottom 25\% 80% anymore.

FTFY. That's pareto distribution for you. Biologically you need one men for every 1000 females. I always wondered how the 50/50 ratio worked out naturally. Turned out it doesn't.

voatgoats • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 12:57 AM

This article makes me feel really great about myself and my life.

Emmenthalreddit • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 02:06 AM

It feels like some women would rather get a guy who will do what they want than a truly good working class guy. I.e. take dumb selfies with them, chauffeur them around, pay for baby photo shoots. Maybe guys are not feeling this.

jewishsupremacist88 • 0 points • 8 May, 2018 11:23 PM

yeah only upper middle class chads are having kids. the working class types get the short end of the stick..same here in the jewSA.

[deleted] • 7 points • 8 May, 2018 11:49 PM

Not true. Low IQ/low income groups have the highest birthrates. High status has lowest.

jewishsupremacist88 • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 12:43 AM

not in the case of norway apparently

Scroober92 • 1 points • 9 May, 2018 02:23 AM **[recovered]**

Actually here in Norway the case seems to be opposite. Atleast, when looking at men. It largely has to do with the fact that our culture puts so much status and emphasis on your ability to make money. Its odd, for a country that "prides" itself on being a socialist utopia our women sure care a fuckton about how

much money you make as a man... They just dont talk about it in public.

Reven311[S] • 2 points • 10 May, 2018 01:53 AM

Because white women are more evolved than black/brown women. White women are K-selectors, black/brown women are r-selectors, due to persisting in an environment that never sees freezing weather and therefore doesn't select for the types of intellect that are useful in the modern world.

Scroober92 • 1 points • 10 May, 2018 02:10 AM [recovered]

Actually didnt think about R and K selection, but you are totally on point with this.

The harsh cold climate made work and innovation a natural part of our survivalism, which in turn made our women select more for men that work/provide better as it was both good genes and for their provider/beta bux needs.

Makes total sense. I guess that is why they are not going for low-paid dudes, as they are unable to adapt to the new age of work etc.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 02:13 AM

Nordics/vikings almost conquered the known world at one time with a relatively small population in extremely harsh environmental conditions. I love that TV show 'Vikings' about them that recently came out a few years ago. It's great man.

peskysquirms • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 06:12 PM*

However I am a white genius who doesn't bow down to the system and the white women around me ignore me because I do not slave away for the system, have spirit, and am too intelligent for their delicate ego, whereas a black girl values me for my depth, after years of teaching. Women's pride and greed and lack of principles, caring only for money and excitement, seems to extend across all. They pretend to have principles but it's always about the money or they'd choose the heroes rather than the corporate swine; pretend values are surface masks to hide their true goals. Seems most only want men who bow down to the system and don't speak their minds against what is, unless he can make significant money from it. The fems who are not part of the system themselves, rejected by their culture and families, who learn to distrust the society they so long for acceptance in, may have potential. Women want ease and convenience and few value any real principles. White women don't seem any better. Principles, low ego, not a dumb slave, and fairly intelligent? Hard to find. The ratio is 20 or 100 to 1 male Vs female, and I'm not sure race is a significant factor, surprisingly. Oddness is, because what is common is wrong and evil. Those few with the strength to reject the insane society around them and know they are sane, eventually, are the only ones with rightness, the only ones worthy of a future.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 09:11 PM

You're smart but you're too disorderly for the white women. I'm the same way.

peskysquirms • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 10:28 PM*

I'm not disorderly, I'm just unpredictable and uncontrollable, a whirling dervish by necessity, for the gyroscope is the most stable of wheels, more stable than a block of wood. Women prefer ease rather than the unexpected; like the Guild Navigators of Dune, they choose the sure and safe path that leads ever to stagnation, a fatal

error. They might fuck the man in the mask, but they don't want to understand him or be there for him in any way that isn't superficial and fleeting. The old penis envy (brain envy, the envy of the weak and flawed against the strong and bright who expose the flaws of the shallow and selfish who do not want to make the effort to improve so that existence can be made better, for they are lazy and greedy and short-sighted, superficial, fearing only the death of their simple seed rather than concerning themselves with the glory of the Race). Thieves. The flaw is in them, and they know it, yet deny it even to themselves. I am not too anything for any real Woman, only for cowardly cows who cannot face the Day.

Wolveryn • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 02:06 PM*

Regardless of the situation, let us not forget that the human population is so out of control now that the only sane choice is to be childless... we've got what 20 years left at the current rate of vicarious living? The entire earth's ocean of fish will be in rare supply in our life time... think about that.

There is no moral reason to have children now... even if you're rich and you can solve all your problems with money. People say it's masculine ... or Red Pill to be a father... I think that's just an attitude passed down from our grandparents' generation and it's dying in ours. The next generation will see a phenomenon of childless people... and this is why I'm going to be hoping we get intelligent robots to a point where they can safely take care of my wrinkled ass when I go to retire... because there sure won't be an abundance of humans around to wipe my ass for minimum wage.

Also I expect to be able to upload my consciousness seamlessly into some kind of computer system so that I can remain in some kind of digital heaven where I can look down through CCTV cameras to observe what humans are getting up to.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 9 May, 2018 04:15 PM

Only the non-white global population is out of control, that's the final red pill to swallow.

Hot_Echo • 1 points • 11 May, 2018 06:25 PM **[recovered]**

So? Just die out dude. No need for whites to exist. World will do fine without whites/purebred whites.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 11 May, 2018 06:30 PM*

My friend... other races lack the intelligence to replace whites, only East Asians (Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, etc, could possibly do that, but they are also in even deeper population collapse as well). The reason is not skin color, it's mainly to do with the lack of intellect required to survive in hot climates that never see freezing weather that adversely affects survival. There, now you have the final red pill. Welcome to the real world, it's not pretty.

EnragedParrot • 1 point • 15 May, 2018 06:07 AM

I've often wondered if this were an influence (easy climate). Is there any credibility to this idea?

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 15 May, 2018 03:25 PM

Yes there is. Easy climates breed less intelligent people. We adapt to our environment.

EnragedParrot • 1 point • 15 May, 2018 03:52 PM

Do you have anything I could cite/read?

I've long thought this, but I'd really like to have credible support. Makes sense from an

evolutionary standpoint.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 15 May, 2018 04:38 PM*

It's extremely difficult to prove any evolutionary theory is 100% true (like female mate selection theories found here), but it's the best theory of human intelligence I've ever seen that explains the disparities in this world. It really has nothing to do with race, but people closer to the equator tend to have darker skin as an adaption to such an environment.

Every 40,000-100,000 years there is an ice age that covers about half the world's land mass in a thick sheet of ice and essentially becomes a barren wasteland. Those that don't adapt die. Those that have never seen a freezing temperature don't need to adapt. The last ice age no doubt had a significant effect on the people of Europe and East Asia.

This is the final red pill associated with the dark enlightenment, which TRP is only one small facet of the whole intellectual domain. Most people are not ready to even consider the possibility that this is actually how the real world operates, it's simply too dark to even think about.

Here are some links that may aid you:

<http://gatesofvienna.blogspot.com/2010/11/explaining-cold-climate-theory-for.html>

<https://www.unz.com/>

<https://www.unz.com/isteve/>

http://www.science20.com/alpha_meme/out_of_africa_what_they_do_not_tell_us-175655

Even Jordan Peterson has to admit that IQ and race is a reality, even though he's in opposition to the more extreme elements of the alt-right that he views as a threat to the social order. It's inevitable they will discover all the genes associated with human intelligence, and then they will run a simple meta analysis comparing various groups and find disparities. The data already likely exists, someone just has to run the analysis to find clear gaps between groups.

As you dive deeper down the rabbit hole you will find a lot of books to read, but I would start with The Bell Curve, Guns, Germs, and Steel, and IQ and the Wealth of Nations.

[1] Harris, Kelley; Nielsen, Rasmus: "The Genetic Cost of Neanderthal Introgression." Genetics 203(2), 881–891 (2016) (DOI: 10.1534/genetics.116.186890)

[2] Richard D. Fuerle: "Erectus walks among us: The Evolution of Modern Humans" Spooner Press NY, (2008)

[3] Michael A. Woodley, Jan te Nijenhuis, Raegan Murphy: "Were the Victorians cleverer than us? The decline in general intelligence estimated from a meta-analysis of the slowing of simple reaction time." Intelligence 41, (2013) 843-850

[4] Nyborg, Helmuth: "The decay of Western civilization: Double relaxed Darwinian Selection." Personality and Individual Differences 53, 118-125 (2012)

[5] Edward Dutton, Richard Lynn: "A negative Flynn Effect in France, 1999 to 2008–9." Intelligence 51, (2015) 67–70

[6] Mingrui Wang, John Fuerst, Jianjun Ren: "Evidence of dysgenic fertility in China." Intelligence 57,(2016) 15-24

EnragedParrot • 2 points • 15 May, 2018 08:57 PM

Damn that's extensive! Thank you, very much. I'm saving this for re-reading and the links.

I own GGS, haven't read yet. Will move to the top of my pile.

I haven't heard "the dark enlightenment" before - but I suspect it'll make sense as I read up.

Thanks again.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 15 May, 2018 09:29 PM

You're very welcome, enjoy.

ktchong • -1 points • 8 May, 2018 10:12 PM

i.e., so it's Darwinism, the survival of the fittest; low-income aka low-quality men, men who are unable to compete, are being filtered out from the gene pool. So why should any red pillers complain?

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 May, 2018 08:40 AM

because there's Darwinian selection not just on individuals, but on societies too. There's a certain line that gets crossed when it goes from an acceptable levels of omega males not reproducing to a dangerous number of beta males who don't feel like they have any reason to be loyal or work for their civilization.

Being betas, they will always follow and work diigently. The catch, however, is that some other group comes along and says "give me your beta loyalty, and I'll give you what the old society promised for your good behaivor but denied you."

"Betas," average guys, the losers in hypergamous societies also make up the majority of cops, soldiers, engineers, electricians.....

The kinds of guys who can't compete in the sexual marketplace but sure as heck compete on the battlefield in modern warfare.

This won't end pretty.....I'd rather we had a civilization that understood red pill ideas and top down oriented society to control hypergamy and keep betas invested.

joner888 • 0 points • 8 May, 2018 09:54 PM

I wait for the great apocalypse so i can create a post apocalyptic Sparta .

headgard • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 01:31 AM

Just means that they don't have to be forced to swallow the blue pill in the name of reproducing! They get to retire early and not forced into a women's ideal world.

Reven311[S] • 3 points • 9 May, 2018 01:33 AM*

Some of them are retiring permanently via suicide, which is why white males in middle-age have suicide rates that have skyrocketed in the past few decades. But nobody cares because these men are worthless to the continuation of society.

andres7832 • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 02:29 AM

A lot more people are choosing to be childless. Both here and in Europe. Japan is similar.

I think this is trying to fit a global reality into RP.

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 May, 2018 03:03 PM

When women do give birth to children, it turns out that it can often be with men who have kids from previous relationships.

The top percent of guys are the only ones women are willing to have a relationship with. Women would rather share an alpha than settle.

Chaddeus_Rex • 0 points • 10 May, 2018 01:05 AM

precipitated a desire/need to promote monogamy

You had me up to here.

People in Ancient cultures were horny fucks. Monogamy was not common in Ancient agricultural societies.

Monogamy came with the advent of Christianity. It is relatively new in human history. It was more a power trip by the Church rather than necessity.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 01:07 AM

Correct, the male / female reproductive ratio spiked to 17-to-1 about 8,000 years ago when agriculture was spreading across the globe. We do not know precisely why this happened, but it's interesting to note.

Religions are created by men, sins are damaging to society, so sex before marriage was classified as a sin by leaders in the male hierarchy, and they used people's tendency to believe in god against them to enforce these new rules.

Chaddeus_Rex • 2 points • 10 May, 2018 01:17 AM

sins are damaging to society,

Sins are based around the dual concept of "good" vs "bad". And the dual concept of "good" vs "bad" arose with Zoroastrianism. However, it was Christianity that took this dual principle of "good" and "bad" and converted it into the concept of "sin".

Prior to Christianity, much of the world operated by a fairly "liberal" attitude towards sex - one could not rape a free woman, but slaves were fair game as long as it wasn't the slaves of another man because that's akin to stealing. Beyond that, nobody cared.

This is why there are accounts of men of all social classes fucking their daughters in Ancient Egypt, Greece and Rome. In Greece, it was common practice to offer ones wife or daughter to a friend as a gesture of good will and with the expectation he would do the same. In Rome, despite the outward appearance of Pater Familias, monogamy did not exist as every patrician household had female slaves, and men would sleep with their daughters and cousins as it was not shameful to their wives as they were technically not 'cheating' as it was women within their families or the women were not free.

The strictly enforced monogamy that was brought about by the Church was merely to gain power over the constituents and thus supplant the existing Pagan religions. This is evident when the previously pagan Russian city states adopted Christianity under Knyaz Vladimir. The Church found it incredibly difficult to implement strict sexual morals because they people enjoyed sex too much and would have it quite openly, in banya's, in fields and on the street and would engage in all manners of "sinful" sex that the

Church did not like.

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 01:18 AM

No, the Roman Empire embraced Christianity to create order and save the empire from fracturing and collapsing.

Chaddeus_Rex • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 01:23 AM

the Roman Empire embraced Christianity to create order and save the empire from fracturing and collapsing.

LOL. Christianity was one of the main reasons WHY the empire collapsed. It was embraced when there was a sizable population of plebians who had embraced Christianity as it promised them goodies when they die and told them they do not need to work hard while they live because that is for the 'sinful'. As the message is an attractive one to the poor and disenfranchised (and the aggressive conversion programs of the early Christians) Christianity spread until Constantine had no choice but to embrace it (which he did only on his deathbed).

I never mentioned why Rome embraced Christianity before this, I dunno where that came from. Mayhaps you confused Rome with Russia?

Reven311[S] • 1 point • 10 May, 2018 01:25 AM

I'm not here to debate the history of religion, good day to you. If it weren't for Christianity the West may have never abandoned slavery as a practice. Pagan beliefs did not morally conflict with using people.

Chaddeus_Rex • 3 points • 10 May, 2018 01:29 AM

If it weren't for Christianity the West may have never abandoned slavery as a practice.

Maybe, maybe not.

Also, I have nothing against slavery. It would be better for many people living in the projects to be slaves (both white and black) in every country, because slaves got fed, got laid and got taken care of (do you take care of your car or house?) vs living every day in abject misery worse than slaves. Hell, the welfare state is actually worse than slavery.

Pagan beliefs did not morally conflict with using people.

Christianity was not what got rid of slavery. It was the pragmatism of those in power at the time. And if you have something against 'using' people, you need to do more redpill reading because morality is for slaves.

marku1 • -2 points • 9 May, 2018 12:09 AM

so wamyn do destroy civilizations? what a surprise much wow.... like an ugly stupid gay priest could tell you that but wUmyn needs "research"....much praise to wamun kind