

Be the patriarch

September 21, 2016 | 377 upvotes | by [Archwinger](#)

We live in a feminist-centered society, filled with double-speak. It's a well-intended society that wants everyone to be happy, but it's a clueless society that has no idea what people really want.

On one hand, our feminist-centered society wants "equality", in that it wants to free everyone, man and woman, from gender roles. Society doesn't want anybody to be held to any standard of behavior based on their sex. It wants a world where there are no such things as girl things or boy things, just things that human beings choose to do or refrain from doing, based on their personal preferences. A hedonistic world where everybody does whatever he or she likes, and nobody judges them for it or has any kind of gendered expectation about what sort of people should do what sort of things.

This pursuit of "equality" has required our feminist-centered society to make a few assumptions, some of them right, some of them dead wrong.

To abolish female gender norms, society needs to assume that female gender norms are wrong and unnatural. That women don't choose to adopt certain "feminine" traits or behaviors by their own free will, but have been conditioned by our formerly patriarchal society to do certain things solely because they are supposed to. To abolish female gender norms, it's necessary to assume that female gender norms are an artificial mask – a construct – and that women aren't really like that. That women only turn out feminine because society forces them to do so.

Frankly, they were right about that. Women aren't naturally "feminine". They're not naturally sexually conservative, demure, submissive creatures that revel in satisfaction when they cook and clean things and perform menial tasks. Society constructed this ideal notion of what a woman should be, and women have been trying to adhere to that ideal for centuries in order to gain social points. Not that long ago, being that kind of woman is what made a girl marriage material, and without a husband, she'd have a very difficult life. Conforming to these artificial ideals of female behavior was necessary for survival.

Today, society has removed most of the restrictions and consequences from female behavior of any sort. There are very few artificial barriers constraining women or forcing them to wear masks. And with these barriers gone, women aren't naturally tending toward traditionally "feminine" behaviors. In the absence of restrictions and consequences, most women are slutty, lazy, manipulative bitches. Women aren't sexually conservative by nature – they're promiscuous as hell if you'll let them be. Women don't like cooking and cleaning shit – women prefer to do absolutely nothing while men who want to fuck them do and buy shit for them. And women aren't shy about leading men on with (sometimes false) promises of love and sex to get what they want.

Unconstrained by social constructs, women aren't "feminine" at all. Because traditional female gender norms are an artificial constraint that society placed on women. The natural state of females isn't traditional femininity. It's hedonism.

For society to combat male gender norms, it's necessary to assume that male gender norms are wrong and unnatural. That when men hit the gym, aggressively pursue professional success, aggressively pursue sex with hot women, and act with strength, confidence, virility, competitiveness, machismo – traditionally "masculine" behaviors – that men aren't really like that. That masculinity is just a mask. Something a bunch of insecure men are pretending to be when really, deep down inside, they're just like women, but are afraid of being judged as unmanly, gay, not fuckable, etc. And that if society were to free men from these shackles of artificial male gender norms, men would pretty much be just like women.

They were dead wrong about this. Men are naturally masculine. Men are aggressive, competitive, and

violent. In fact, out the other side of its mouth, in an impressive feat of double-speak, our society says exactly that! They argue that if we were to remove all consequences from men, men would be inclined to be violent rapists and murderers, and it's only societal constraints and the fear of punishment that keeps man's naturally violent, sexually aggressive impulses in check. That's why we need to "teach men" to be better! Because men are naturally masculine. It's not a mask.

When society opted to begin to teach men to be more feminine and to cast off the shackles of conventional, "toxic" masculine behaviors, this wasn't done to free men and help them cast off the artificial mask of masculinity that they all felt forced to wear. This was done to constrain their unmasked male natures and force them into a mask. The mask of modern masculinity. Under the guise of "freeing" men from gender roles, society has actively sought to put men in chains by reinventing an artificial, constrained, safer, less "toxic", female-centered version of masculinity and telling men that to be a real man, you need to be like that. That it's those conventionally masculine men that are the fakers, who are wearing masks and acting out artificial roles.

Not so. Unconstrained by social constructs, men are very definitely "masculine", in the conventional sense. The natural state of males is aggression.

The root of all of this societal pursuit of change is very simple: Men are stronger than women. Physically stronger. Period. And women live in constant fear of this.

The only reason women have any power at all is because men play along. Men allow them to have the illusion of power. They only reason a woman can safely travel from point A to point B without being raped or murdered by a stronger man is because men are playing along. And any given man at any given time could just say fuck it and quit playing along. Women live in constant fear of that.

For females to have any sense of equality, society needs to neuter man's superior strength. It needs to retrain and reeducate men and redefine masculinity. Women can't beat men physically, so they need to reengineer society so that society keeps men weak for them.

Society's goal is to keep you out of the gym, temper your aggression and competitive nature, hobble your confidence, and placate you with porn, beer, video games, and other creature comforts. Turn you into an emotional hedonist. Just like a woman. Because women are afraid of men.

Remember, when you bulk up at the gym, when you confidently approach a woman, when she sees you coming, when other women see you walking past – they get uncomfortable. They're afraid of you. You're stronger than they are in every way. You have the power to rape or kill any of them. They're weak. And even though you have no intention of doing anything of the sort, some part of their unconscious mind is afraid you might.

Women naturally submit to powerful, aggressive men out of fear. They're afraid of you. And that fear – that adrenaline – translates into excitement. It turns them on. When their unconscious mind feels powerless next to you, like their only choice is to submit, their bodies respond by becoming aroused. And this scares women shitless.

You don't have any allies in society. Society isn't just anti-red pill. Society is anti-masculinity. Society doesn't want you to be a strong, successful, confident badass. Society wants you to be a woman, because if you act like a man, women are afraid of you.

So fuck society. Hit the gym, be an aggressive, masculine badass, and bully the hell out of women. You're stronger. They fear you, and the only reason they have any power whatsoever is because we, as men, let them. In the way you walk and the way you carry yourself, never hesitate to implicitly remind them of that fact. Every time they speak and act, every time walk from point A to point B safely, it's because you choose to let them. You are their benevolent patriarch.

Check out this and other content on The Red Pill's off-Reddit site. Here's a [link](#).

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

PragmaticRedTruth • 77 points • 21 September, 2016 05:21 PM **[recovered]**

The only reason women have any power at all is because men play along.

And sadly, are manipulated from birth to play along. For so many, there isn't even a choice or a chance.

This post is exactly why The Red Pill causes such depression in men. It destroys their view of the world.

It's not love, it's dopamine and oxytocin.

It isn't until men can realize "things for what they are," that they can see that their laziness, isn't laziness... it's increased cortisol. It's other hormones wreaking havoc because they haven't been taking care of their body. They have been filling it with useless sugar. They have been eating for fun, and not for function. They are using their programming and overthinking everything. They're fearing everything. They have been sucked into just what the world hoped they'd get sucked into.

Many years ago, society didn't have police. They had armies, but no police. They created religion. They needed to in order to instill fear and create comfort. With the population increasing, and societies knowledge growing, they found the most subtle ways to control mass amounts of people, and it's working.

Well, it's working for the most part. There are some of us who can see through it, and understand that after the death of our ego, we can reconstruct our world views and get to the roots of what is important in life.

Archwinger[S] • 81 points • 21 September, 2016 07:37 PM

It gets worse from there. Men who are conditioned from a young age -- sometimes not even intentionally -- to be effeminate, emotional, non-aggressive, and eschew competition, turn out the way they do due to positive, well-intended advice. And they're screwed.

Most people genuinely believe that looks don't matter so much and that focusing obsessively on the gym and muscles, clothes, and hair is just narcissism. Yet you can count the number of bald or fat presidents on one hand, and there are documented studies that not just women, but men -- male employers -- treat good looking male employees better.

Most people genuinely believe that women prefer a guy who's open with his emotions, who showers her with genuine, heartfelt affection, who dotes on her and does for her and sacrifices her. And we know how that turns out.

Most people genuinely believe that a guy should just be himself, not just with women but in life, and that things will work out as long as we're authentic and genuine. Because we're all special snowflakes. We're all valuable and unique human beings. So naturally, if we're all true to ourselves, shit will just work out and we'll find our place.

So we have all of these non-masculine men who turned out this way with the best of intentions. And they aren't successful in life. Not with women, not professionally, not socially. These guys are depressed and have serious mental health issues. Some commit suicide.

And immediately, society turns around and blames masculinity. These men are depressed and killing themselves because they failed to measure up to old-school, conventional Rambo/John Wayne standards of masculinity, and this depressed them, so they swallowed a bottle of pain pills and left this world. And the only solution is, of course, to eliminate conventional masculinity. Redefine it so that these failures and wastes don't feel so bad -- reassure them that even though they don't get laid, aren't successful professionally or socially, and have totally failed at life, that they're still "real men".

People genuinely believe that these failures of men are killing themselves over some kind of word definition. Due to some ideological standard of manhood they're not meeting. Not so.

Effeminate, non-aggressive losers are killing themselves because they can't get laid, suck socially and have trouble networking professionally and making friends, and they're lonely and feel like failures. It has nothing to do with some arbitrary ideal of what is or isn't a real man. They're not killing themselves over definitions of a word and whether they meet that definition. They're killing themselves because their lives suck.

Teaching men proper masculinity is a life or death matter. Guys who fail at life end up with mental health issues, kill themselves, or shoot up universities, and telling them "don't worry, you're still a real man even though you don't get laid, can't hold a job, and don't have friends" doesn't fix the issue.

PragmaticRedTruth • 20 points • 21 September, 2016 08:50 PM [recovered]

The slogan "real man," pisses me off more than anything. I actually cringe when I hear that. If that isn't the most manipulative shit I've ever heard, I don't know what is. "You're not living up to the standard, you're just a fuck boy." Everytime I hear it, I know it's wormed itself into another mind of the blue pill.

They're not killing themselves over definitions of a word and whether they meet that definition.
They're killing themselves because their lives suck.

And that is entirely because they spent their life living up to a standard that feminism/women have set on what a "real man" is. Just like /u/redpillschool had said in an interview the day TRP was on the front page of reddit, "most men subconsciously do the things they do in order to increase their sexual worth."

So you have these men taking advice from feminists and women, and they don't even know what the fuck they're giving advice about, they're talking about how they feel, and how they think a man should be (AKA a beta cuck who cares about his wife's happiness over his own.). But that's not what women or men want, it's the worlds biggest fuck up. It was lost in translation. She actually believes that is what she wants. When she says, "be yourself," she just means don't be awkward. Men have taken it very literal. And men are willing to fit this model because subconsciously, they do so much in their life just to increase their sexual worth. But they don't know how awful that advice is, they don't know how different the language is between each of the sexes.

When it all doesn't work out, not only are they not a "real man," but yes, suicide is one of the only answers left. They couldn't meet women's expectations, and didn't have any for themselves.

There is a painful period of reprogramming, but you've only got to do it once. When you're completely through, you know your own self, women's tendencies, and what your path is, and this is the greatest "feeling" a man can have.

[deleted] • 9 points • 22 September, 2016 05:04 AM

I think when they say "just be yourself," they ultimately mean "be more masculine and confident in yourself"

RPFlame • 12 points • 22 September, 2016 10:22 AM

The fact that we have to interpret what "be yourself" could possibly even translate to, blatantly points out the double speak nature men have to deal with.

scissor_me_timbers00 • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 12:37 PM

Yeah this is exactly what it means. Frankly "just be yourself" never made sense to me growing up. I always intuitively knew there was something off about the advice. Not that I knew the solution either tho.

metrondo • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 06:42 AM

do you have advice for someone standing at the beginning of this "reprogramming"? i am tired of all the shit going through my head.

[deleted] • 7 points • 22 September, 2016 11:06 AM

give it time. It took years to become the way you are now, it will take years to completely change your mental model of the world.

Reread the sidebar once every 6 months, read the recommended books, let it sink in. Fucking lift. Talk to chicks, lots of them.

Suddenly, you will see the theory in action, everywhere. Your vision changes. That is when you know you're on the right track.

Good luck buddy.

Kingoffistycuffs • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 10:40 AM

Same advice you should always have here. Read and put into action the side bar. Get out of your own way and get on it!

RPFlame • 8 points • 22 September, 2016 10:19 AM

Effeminate, non-aggressive losers are killing themselves because they can't get laid, suck socially and have trouble networking professionally and making friends, and they're lonely and feel like failures. It has nothing to do with some arbitrary ideal of what is or isn't a real man. They're not killing themselves over definitions of a word and whether they meet that definition. They're killing themselves because their lives suck.

It's not a hyperbole if I say that I was entertaining the idea to do it before I found TRP, and typing this comment is proof that I opted to struggle instead of giving up. Yet I don't feel that I deserve the winner's award just because I chose to.

The political correct push does more harm than good for everyone. Telling people to be comfortably fat won't save them from all the proven health risks that obesity entails. Telling people to be comfortably losers won't give them money to pay the bills.

Just FYI, even the perceived "non-aggressive" loser has a gateway/escapist way to express his aggression to satiate himself: Video games, online boards to argue semantics and so on. It's really a natural inclination.

CQC3 • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 07:28 PM

Effeminate, non-aggressive losers are killing themselves because they can't get laid, suck socially and have trouble networking professionally and making friends, and they're lonely and feel like failures. It has nothing to do with some arbitrary ideal of what is or isn't a real man. They're not killing themselves over definitions of a word and whether they meet that definition. They're killing themselves because their lives suck.

Yes, and even more so they were robbed of the tools to help themselves.

You said aggression is the natural male state, and I agree. However, I'd like to add a distinction that aggression to me isn't about violence or even physical presence, or even overt behavior. Aggression is a mindset. Aggression is to pursue, to be persistent. A man is one who overcomes.

I agree that the stereotypical masculinity was restrictive to just a few archetypes, and that a little loosening up was in order. Even a sensitive artist type can be masculine, it's in the mindset, that innate aggression and need to overcome. That obsession with finding your own truths, finding some sort of meaning and pursuing it's realization. These are things that consume men alone.

The problem as you outline, is that even the effeminate men shut down their masculine instincts. Their superficial behavior is somewhat feminine, but the problem is their methodologies and way of interacting with the world is feminine as well. They're wishy washy, don't want to make themselves their own agents of change. They embrace passivity like women, they don't grunt and bear the unpleasantness of something to reach the prize.

fingerthemoon • 1 point • 26 September, 2016 10:05 AM

telling them "don't worry, you're still a real man even though you don't get laid, can't hold a job, and don't have friends" doesn't fix the issue.

And they do that with women. Body-positive: Even if you're fat, ugly and mean, you're still a beauty queen. Because beauty is confidence in yourself... The cognitive dissonance is out of control. Women try to act like men they would be attracted too and men try to act like women they would be attracted too. And to call this out is blasphemous and offensive to the extreme.

scarletspider3 • 20 points • 21 September, 2016 06:00 PM

When I first started school (STEM field) I used to hear everyone praising the female students. They used to encourage them by telling them all the money and power that they'll have afterwards. I used to wonder why I never got any encouragement like that. Now I see that women these days don't want men to achieve, they want the girls to achieve and the men to be powerless.

askmrcia • 17 points • 21 September, 2016 10:30 PM

My first year of grad school my female professor said "look at all these women in this MBA class. You guys are going to have great futures. I'm just happy to see so many women in this class."

Then later that semester I remember her saying "women I just want you to know, when working at a company, look at the top executive managers. If they don't look like you, then you know you won't get that far."

Now those statements went over my head, but the more I read the redpill, the more I understand how the school system is geared more towards women. I'm still in grad school and you won't believe the amount of hand holding the female students have. I'm serious. I've seen it all. Girls going to the dean because the professor gave them a bad grade, girls trying to get a professor fired because they made a joke about Ray Rice, girls getting male students to do their work, ect...

I brought this up because i too didn't get encouragement like the women students.

The educational system is truly fucked.

juliman17 • 7 points • 23 September, 2016 04:51 PM

Let me tell you a little story that happened about 3 months ago.

Accounting II class. I've always been good with it so basically i aced tests and payed little attention in class, 30% of the class time was this beta profesor explaining each concept to each girl that didn't understand it as if they were 5. And the amount of compliments he gave them was unbelievable.

After classes were done we had finals exams. I scored a 10/10 and only got a gj. A female friend on the

other hand (HB 7. 22 y/o) asked me if the professor told me anything about the perfect test, said no, why? And she sent me a screenshot from an email our profesor sent her after the exam, basically complimenting her on the exam (she barely passed with a 4/10). Wishing her best of luck etc.

Just pathetic, when i read it i laughed so much but it's the sad reality we men live in. No one is going to validate our work or compliment us. We have to be able to see the truth and validate ourselves when we deserve it. Stay strong brothers. It's always darkest before dawn

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 05:51 AM

It's highly discrimitatory when they sat this because for years now females have outperformed males in schooling

G_Petronius • 58 points • 21 September, 2016 03:55 PM **[recovered]**

This could honestly be the official TRP primer. All the fundamentals are in it and it's a compelling narrative.

FieldLine • 9 points • 21 September, 2016 09:58 PM

Congrats on the EC tag. It's about time.

blue_dover • 21 points • 21 September, 2016 05:30 PM **[recovered]**

I am going to read this shit before bed every night - This post is better than prayers

obama_loves_nsa • 10 points • 21 September, 2016 08:15 PM

I think it pushed the fear factor well but missed out on the fact that women get wet over that. THEY WORSHIP YOU when you are in total control.

[deleted] • 22 points • 21 September, 2016 07:34 PM

[permanently deleted]

EatmyShorts59 • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 01:39 PM*

I was thinking the same thing,

Act like a woman, and you are more easily controlled.

Edit : /u/NeoreactionSafe posted this video on some thread.

People will categorize this as "Conspiracy theorist"

But if you can remain impartial / unbiased. and go into this presentation open minded - this guy is honestly dropping some thought provoking ideas about the world we are living in.

<https://youtu.be/9PhR4iuOETA>

NeoreactionSafe • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 02:35 PM

All criminals claim they are innocent.

"You are making up a conspiracy theory."

The truth is that crimes do occur.

The Globalist Tyranny really wants a prison planet of Dumbed Down slaves and history has shown that men who are free thinking are always the greatest threat to power.

So to eliminate the threat you reduce males to the level of betas... not much different than women.

Pacification.

EatmyShorts59 • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 07:26 PM

Bro. I pray you didn't take my comment as an attack against you.

I absolutely love the videos / comments you post.

I would love to know if you have any other recommendations.

NeoreactionSafe • 0 points • 23 September, 2016 02:14 AM

Sometimes it's like I'm psychic.

Last weekend I described this exact story (with less detail) to someone:

<https://youtu.be/Uo2tVWP9LtE>

...there seems to be a "collective unconscious" sometimes.

The story was "floating on the ether".

EatmyShorts59 • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 01:28 PM

The world is a scary place.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 02:14 PM

It's so funny because I used to love the Bush family.

Had I known then what I know now I'm not sure how life would have went, but it would have altered things significantly.

All of them Bush, Clinton, Obama are all in the Globalist Tyranny.

EatmyShorts59 • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 02:40 PM

So are you going to vote this year?

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 23 September, 2016 05:32 PM

Sure.

I'll give Trump a chance to be president, try to change the status quo, then get assassinated by the Globalist Tyranny.

Then the nation will be forced to see what really is happening.

BlackJ1 • 19 points • 21 September, 2016 04:51 PM

Archwinger at it again with another great post. Sidebar material for sure.

What a lot of people refuse to believe is that humans aren't "basically good". We are not born to "be good" or consider morals.

[deleted] • 20 points • 21 September, 2016 05:10 PM

YEah. Put Arch's two categories of people together -- unconstrained women and unconstrained men.

Unconstrained women: Lazy, manipulative, stupid, bitchy, sluts.

Unconstrained men: Unproductive asshole criminals who do whatever the fuck they want, to whomever they want, and who earn/produce just enough to meet their own immediate physical needs.

What do you have? The "top" of today's sexual market place. The most sexually attractive men and the most sexually available women. Fucking each other.

[deleted] • 6 points • 21 September, 2016 07:37 PM

[permanently deleted]

BluepillProfessor • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 04:54 PM

And paid for by the State (aka men's taxes).

People don't get how Red Pill can be completely a-political but yet most Terps tend to be on the alt-right side of the equation. It is because Red Pill shows us that Feminism is Marxism in panties and the welfare state is largely used up by women.

Stythe • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 11:11 AM

This is the best part. A shitty single mother will set the worst examples possible for unproductive humans while simultaneously telling men to be good and do the right thing. A boy who try to comprehend those mixed messages is bound to have a fucked up mentality.

Even the most well intentioned single mother is going to cause problems simply because she doesn't understand the male experience and can't comprehend what it is to be masculine.

That's fucked.

RedPillAnonymous • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 12:34 PM

Unconstrained men will not turn into a bunch of criminal assholes, doing "whatever the fuck they want, to whomever they want", a few will, but men will be afraid of other men and the majority will prefer peace, law and order to a winner take all competition the majority will lose.

Men instinctively care about women, much the same way that we instinctively care about children. An individual man attacking a woman will be dealt with like a man attacking a child. Men aren't a bunch of natural alphas brainwashed into being beta.

Women and betas work together to control the alphas, the women just think they can give all their sex to the alphas in secret and keep the betas on their side by publicly denouncing the men they are crazy about. They get their cake and eat it, with ice cream and sprinkles too.

The red pill is betas waking up to all this, and breaking ranks with the feminine imperative.

[deleted] • 5 points • 22 September, 2016 01:11 PM*

The structures have to be there to provide for peace, law and order. Those structures were put there because men instinctively care about women and children. But if the structures aren't there, then men do what they must, and the strongest among them do what they want, until someone stronger and more powerful stops them or reins them in.

You think women work with betas to control alphas, and this is the "natural" state of things? It is not. We are seeing the natural state of things now -- women provide for themselves, so they can have sex with alphas and, if they can, take the scant resources betas have. Alphas get everything -- the money, the power, the resources, and the sex. Betas get whatever alphas allow them to have.

That's the natural state of humans -- alphas get everything through force or because it's given to them by men below them. Alphas get to fuck most of the women. Betas are allowed to exist because they serve alphas and know their place; those who can't or won't serve are removed from the group one way or another. Women fuck the men they're attracted to -- alphas.

What you describe requires all sorts of artificial constraints, controls and "boosts". Women were put in protected positions. Their sexual power is immense, and can be used to manipulate. Agreements were made among everyone to impose constraints on women's sexuality precisely because it IS so powerful. Women are also put in protected positions because they are unable to defend themselves and because women are needed to propagate the species. Every woman is needed, but only a few men are needed. Alphas agreed to forego fucking all the women, in exchange for their using their natural power to choose one (maybe two), but they get first pick, and they choose the very best women. If they cheat and sleep with more women, they have to be discreet about it. Betas get the 80% of women left over. The status of men is artificially elevated, so that ALL men, including unattractive betas and lower men, have status simply by dint of their gender. This made them at least APPEAR attractive to women.

This system works, but in order for it to work, everyone has to do their part. Women decided they didn't want to live that way anymore. They decided they wanted to earn their own money and be "free", so they could be "independent" and fuck the men they wanted to fuck instead of having to fuck the one man they could have long term. Alphas, being the power structure in society, decided to give it to them, because women wanted it, because it was "fair", and because they could be freed up to fuck more women.

Women sold all this to betas as "we will want to fuck you too and you won't have to be married to us to do it! And even better is that you won't have to provide for us either, because we will earn our own money and you can earn your own money and keep it for yourselves." We all know how that worked out -- women flocked to the top 20% of men for sex; then married betas, from whom they demanded financial support but to whom they refused sex. So betas continued to pay and pay; and get even less for it.

RedPillAnonymous • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 02:08 PM

Alphas, being the power structure in society....

This is your central misconception. Alpha does not mean this. Cory Worthington demonstrates alpha. Pretty sure he's not in charge of anything. Prisons are full of alphas.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 02:14 PM

Alpha is all situational. Cory Worthington is alpha in his particular milieu. Or at least he was.

The "alpha power structure", at least as I'm discussing it, is men with money, status and power at the top of society. Not men for whom the only things they have going for them are good looks and cocky attitudes.

In a less refined society, "alpha power structure" would be the ruling class and warrior class. The men willing to kill people and break things would be "alpha".

RedPillAnonymous • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 04:10 PM

Money, status, and power = beta bucks

Good looks and cocky attitudes = alpha fucks

BluepillProfessor • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 05:12 PM

The structures have to be there to provide for peace, law and order.

Beat me to it. Hobbes describes life with unconstrained masculinity. Today we still constrain men without restraining women in any way.

Auvergnat • 12 points • 21 September, 2016 07:10 PM

Whoever turned on the faucet of epic redpill content, please keep it on. This week is a fireworks of awesome posts.

meburpme • 2 points • 23 September, 2016 06:58 AM

Can you please link to other good posts this week?

our_guile • 10 points • 21 September, 2016 07:37 PM

This is among the best posts I've read since TRP's inception. It covers all the bases succinctly in a mature tone, definitely sidebar worthy material.

RPFlame • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 09:53 AM*

They were dead wrong about this. Men are naturally masculine. Men are aggressive, competitive, and violent. In fact, out the other side of its mouth, in an impressive feat of double-speak, our society says exactly that! They argue that if we were to remove all consequences from men, men would be inclined to be violent rapists and murderers, and it's only societal constraints and the fear of punishment that keeps man's naturally violent, sexually aggressive impulses in check. That's why we need to "teach men" to be better! Because men are naturally masculine. It's not a mask.

Even the biggest beta/omega who sits at home 24/7 shoving doritos and mountain dew would know that their aggression and competitiveness never left them. They were just taught to channel it through shit like video games and online boards via arguing semantics and taste, or at best by watching sports on TV and pretend that this is a masculine ACTIVE-ity so they can feel like real men for a few minutes.

I was pondering last week what the fuck is it that drives people to say "well, your taste in movies is shit and mine is superior". Why the fuck some people use movies or TV shows as a reference point to prove that you're better than someone else. It's competitiveness. The most underachiever, the biggest fucktard loser and waste of space on Earth will still get his sense of superiority from competing with other fucktard losers online over who likes the best TV show or movie. They really have no personal achievement to display, since all their energy is channeled in video games and masturbation, which is basically conning your brain into thinking that you're the one who nails that hot bitch and she enjoys it. "Well, wait until you see my level 34534540 orc paladin" they'll proclaim as they shove their heads back into investing in a virtual man/woman while they do fuck all to invest in themselves.

Deep down they feel like they were conned. They were never told how the game of life is played, either because they had shit parents or just a beta faggot father, so all they had to listen for hints are the girls they ended up befriending (might as well ask the fish what wants for dinner instead of watching what the fish goes really after), other boys who are their competition (can you tell me how to become better than you please?) or their social circle (which by now was the same loser pack of shit as they are, so enjoy the lack of information).

This is why when they finally come by chance in here, and assuming that they get to have the balls to entertain the idea that maybe they indeed had no fucking idea how the game is played, they end up learning why the girl they fell in love with didn't displayed any of the traits they were implicitly told to expect if they are nice to them,

why that cunning guy who takes care of his appearance and knows the game of office politics gets promoted and gets to have everything he wants in life.

But the deep want to compete and conquer is inside them. To fuck the hot girl, to achieve in life, to prevail over competitors. And it frustrates the shit out of them because they were conditioned their entire life to behave in a manner that achieves anything but what they want. So in a last ditch effort they stop procrastinating, they struggle with finding a goal in life, they hit up the gym, they fix their diet, they try to socialize, all the while they have to struggle with the fact that they join the game so fucking late compared to the ones they were playing it since they were kids, and even after struggling until the end the result might be "better than nothing".

Yes, I'm platinum mad.

[deleted] • 12 points • 21 September, 2016 06:16 PM

While I agree with all of this, there are two points that could be brought out more.

The only reason women have any power at all is because men play along. Men allow them to have the illusion of power.

Yes, but *why* do they play along? I think there are two parts. The first is that men are by nature biased in favour of women - almost as much as women are biased in favour of themselves. That is, men's bias in favour of women is *not* counterbalanced by women's bias in favour of men (which is not present at all). Hence feminism, and why men did not shut it down right from the start, which they could easily do.

Second, governments and corporations look to gain by suppressing men and turning them into women. Women are more obedient and less aggressive, they will conform to expectations more. So governments like it, because they don't want to be on the receiving end of a Western 'arab spring'. Corporations also support it because it keeps the cost of labour down.

It may also be the case that governments are looking for an alternative to wars in keeping the population down, now that nuclear weapons change the consequences of that. We used to be able to kill of lots of young men in war, but now the blighters keep on living and want to breed. So, turn women against them.

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 05:14 PM

I claim in a podcast:

"Female in group preference is 6 to 1. Male out group preference for females is 2 to 1. So when women are favored in society and social relations and then demand "equal rights" then... it is not really "equal" now is it."

[deleted] • 12 points • 21 September, 2016 04:39 PM

The only reason women have any power at all is because men play along. Men allow them to have the illusion of power. The only reason a woman can safely travel from point A to point B without being raped or murdered by a stronger man is because men are playing along. And any given man at any given time could just say fuck it and quit playing along. Women live in constant fear of that.

Certain people don't like it when I say this, but it's just a fact.

If enough men decided not to "play by the rules" and decided to use brute physical force with women (and weak men), they could do it, and there would be nothing anyone could do to stop them.

If enough men decided to rape women, they could do it, and there would be nothing anyone could do to stop them.

We have criminal laws and courts and prisons to stop it. And that's what constrains men. Living in an ordered

society that doesn't permit rape and sexual assault.

But if we didn't have those things, and if enough men decided to use violent physical force to achieve whatever objectives they wanted, they could do it. The only thing that would stop them is a group of other, more powerful, stronger men, using more violence and more physical force.

blackchadthundercock • 17 points • 21 September, 2016 04:59 PM **[recovered]**

If **every single man** woke up tomorrow morning and said *enough* feminism would be stamped out by 5pm.

FieldLine • 15 points • 21 September, 2016 10:10 PM

You don't even have to go that far. Feminism is the product of a lazy, entitled generation. The reason that people have time to get offended about arbitrary definitions and gender pronouns is because they aren't worried about whether they will have what to eat or a place to sleep.

The moment shit starts to get difficult, whether that be because of a war or a natural disaster, feminism and all of these other social issues are going to be the first things to get booted off the agenda.

slay_it_forward • 2 points • 21 September, 2016 09:48 PM

If men banded together we could put all women back in the kitchen and making babies again. We could literally take away everything in a blink of an eye and there's nothing they could do. Sorry ladies, no more university, no more cock carousel, no more drunk all night then pizza after-party, no more voting. Why? Because men said so and we were in the mood to show you how little power you really have.

CDBaller • 0 points • 21 September, 2016 07:59 PM

I dare say feminism wouldn't last past breakfast. There's a saying in the military that "we do more than the rest of the world combined before 9 A.M." That's what society would become.

[deleted] • 7 points • 22 September, 2016 07:58 AM

Conversationally, if all women stopped being attracted to masculine men and all began to like effeminate betas instead, the red pill and masculinity in general would be gone by 6 am.

CDBaller • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 01:38 PM

Sure, but that's the beauty: it's a biological imperative that women be attracted to alphas. They can't "choose to stop" because it's the way women are designed, evolved, whatever theory you subscribe to, to ensure propagation of the species.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 02:06 PM

The same way men en-masse can't stop being biased towards women. The same way we can't stop hypergamy, male infidelity etc.

I mean, everything about human nature is either beautiful or tragic, depending on how you look at it.

CDBaller • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:15 PM*

I agree that we have a natural protective instinct toward women, but there is a difference between that and putting up with feminism, otherwise the historical sexual dynamic would be matriarchal.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:30 PM

Well, actually I always say that patriarchy was created (with the agrarian revolution)

not because men hate women, but because they love them too much.

Top men were getting sex anyway. It was the ugly ones who wanted a woman and could not get one. But alas, to women being given to a man they do not want is sexual abuse pure and simple. Men don't think about it in these terms because they are not programmed to seek out the best genes. You have to imagine that each time a woman has sex with a man she finds undesirable, her whole radar goes into alarm. Imagine that being the only sexual experience she gets her whole life.

CDBaller • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 04:29 PM*

As it says in the OP, the natural state is patriarchy because of the difference in physical strength in men and women.

I'll agree that the agrarian revolution added to Patriarchy because men realized that to build a stable society, there had to be an equitable distribution of women among men in order to keep the betas from rising up and destroying society and the chaos that would ensue. The monotheistic religions especially added to this on down the road apiece. And it still kept the dynamic steady because alpha females were paired with alpha males and alpha males could still keep harems or go to war to rape, pillage and plunder women, to follow the male instinct of spreading the seed, if they were so inclined.

Betas were happy to be getting sex and raising families and beating or killing your woman for cheating on you was allowed under certain conditions. A cheating spouse was absolute social disgrace.

No one cared what women thought of the arrangement. What were they going to do? Rebel?

Women were still benefited immensely by the arrangement because they could secure resources through marriage, didn't have to keep an occupation that a male would, and were generally taken care of in the long-term, whether or not she was satisfied in the short.

Women realized that advancement came through good marriage to a suitable male. A woman could always hope her man died, as frequently happened, go through a few years of mourning back at her parents' and if she was lucky and still in her prime years, remarry as soon as socially acceptable. But the reality here is that the first marriage is her best shot at bagging an alpha, unless by great coincidence, there was the rare social riser who needed her family's name, status and money and could put all to good use.

This is where arranged marriage comes into play. Attractive women could significantly help their families climb the social ladder through marriage and give access to better social circles, which resulted in advancement in a family business, access to new deals through those social circles and general social mobility. An arranged marriage was no small decision. A patriarch looking to climb only had so many children in so many years, so each step was very calculated, if he was smart. This also contributed to the young age of marriage.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 04:55 PM

All this is true, but again you are talking about beautiful women. An ugly incel

back in the day (imagine Nikola Tesla) could still make something of himself even if he did not marry. An ugly woman was barred from education, there was no hope for her to get an alpha, and she was forced to endure the sexual abuse (sorry but that is what it feels like to her) of a husband she felt nothing for just to survive. And her looks would not get better with the wall, would they? So unlike an ugly man who could make something of himself and even live as a bachelor if he wanted, she could do almost nothing to improve her life.

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 05:19 PM

It is not like there are not recent historical examples of the true state of nature- Berlin, 1945. Nan King, 1937. Mount Sinjar, 2015. Nigeria 2016. The rapes don't stop until a group of stronger men make the men stop.

Strum_Gewehr • 2 points • 21 September, 2016 05:22 PM

The main reason to get men to play by the rules is because we need to protect our mothers/wives/sisters/daughters. If the rules are taken way too far after social equilibrium is achieved then it starts damaging the ones on which constraints have been placed. Ill call this overcivilization

Holyshitspace • -1 points • 22 September, 2016 05:35 AM

Fucking hell you people truly are vile disgusting monsters.

[deleted] • 5 points • 22 September, 2016 01:05 PM*

The entirety of human history is groups of rough, unrefined men using brute physical force to get what they need and take what they want. The only thing that stops them is larger, stronger groups of rough, unrefined men who use greater or more effective brute physical force to get more of what they need and take what they want. The defeated men are either killed, dispersed, or assimilated into the conquering tribe/group/nation.

Now, in more diplomatic times, groups of slightly more refined men use the **threat** of brute physical force to get what they need and take what they want. This is called "politics". This is "international relations". This is called "diplomacy". When it escalates and then reverts to physical force, they call it "hostilities" and "war".

All of diplomacy, politics and international statecraft is essentially competing statements of "it is in our mutual interests to compromise so we both can get something we want. But we can't get everything we want, and here's what we're willing to give up. But you must also give up something." Sometimes, one party says "fuck you, we're not giving up anything, and we will take from you what you have and keep it for ourselves." When the other says "no", then force must be used to assert or defend a position. That is called "war". War is nothing less and nothing more than a tool groups of men use to get what they need and take what they want. It is and always has been an instrument of policy toward other groups of men.

When you think about it a bit and stop your pearl clutching, you'll see that this is simply the human condition.

[deleted] • -1 points • 22 September, 2016 05:29 PM

Oh hey PemBayliss, long time no see! How's the TRP-influenced lifestyle going; are you happier than you used to be when on PPD?

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 01:17 PM

Sure. Being a shitlord is awesome. How bout you, troll? Still yukking it up at the less fortunate and schadenfraude-ing it over at TBP?

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 01:32 PM

Being a shitlord is awesome.

Is it really, though? It's true that I don't run into you all that often, but when I *do* run into you, you usually seem pretty angry. Even right now, your response to a friendly greeting was protective sarcasm and lashing out. You sure you're doing alright?

And nah, I don't spend that much time on TBP anymore. Being exposed to the followers of TRP/MGTOW/inceldom on a regular basis is pretty discouraging, makes it easy to stop seeing the good in people and see or expect only the bad. I've been spending more of my time in my niche-interest subreddits, or on SRD when I want some juicy drama. It's just a more cheerful way of spending my time, y'know? Less bitterness, less suspicion, less posturing. Thanks for asking though!

Are you still spending most of your time on the TRP subs and crusading against evil on PPD?

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 01:41 PM

Your claim that any of your exchanges with me or anyone else on TRP or PPD is a "friendly greeting" is laughable. Your contacting me here was little more than sneering snark, which is what you always offered at PPD.

Go the fuck away.

[deleted] • 1 points • 23 September, 2016 01:43 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 September, 2016 02:13 PM

What you did was you came on here to snark. You didn't come here to engage in conversation; you came here to snark. Take that shit back to TBP.

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 05:23 PM

He wasn't advocating rape. What are you talking about? You believe humans are naturally good and don't require social restraints? Or you just don't understand the conversation?

bassline8 • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 09:45 AM

Spending your birthday looking for posts to be offended about?

Kingoffistycuffs • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 07:15 PM

What the thing your type likes to say? Not everyone is like that? Is that it? Then shut the fuck up you stupid fuck puppet!

soviet_dissident • 3 points • 21 September, 2016 06:04 PM*

I think this does a great job in laying bare the real meaning behind when we say society has become/is becoming, more feminized. Women are encouraged to become more true to their nature:

"Women aren't naturally "feminine". They're not naturally sexually conservative, demure, submissive

creatures that revel in satisfaction when they cook and clean things and perform menial tasks. Society [read: men] constructed this ideal notion of what a woman should be, and women have been trying to adhere to that ideal for centuries in order to gain social points. Not that long ago [before the welfare state], being that kind of woman is what made a girl marriage material, and *without a husband, she'd have a very difficult life.* *Conforming to these artificial ideals of female behavior was necessary for survival.*"

At the same time, men are encouraged to be less like their nature and be more feminine:

"Men are naturally masculine. Men are aggressive, competitive, and violent... If we were to remove all consequences from men, men would be inclined to be violent rapists and murderers, and it's only societal constraints and the fear of punishment that keeps man's naturally violent, sexually aggressive impulses in check. That's why we need to "teach men" to be better! *Because men are naturally masculine. It's not a mask.*"

Men have done the hard work in mitigating male aggressiveness (i.e., creating civilization) and making life much easier for women. For all of this, they demanded that women eschew the worst aspects of their nature and be grateful, faithful, reliable, loving partners for the men and good mothers to their children. It strikes me that lovely, loyal women are a major incentive for men to maintain civilization and that without this carrot these incentives become greatly diminished.

If men think they are getting a raw deal or the women aren't worth protecting, they will surely practice indifference *or* outright hostility and revert to aggressiveness to get what they want. The first (indifference) is being borne out in the Western world, and particularly apparent with the migrant issues. Fear of the power of the State likely inhibits the second for the time being, though some degree of institutional collapse would surely reshuffle these incentives.

thelaptoliquidator • 6 points • 21 September, 2016 03:54 PM*

"Filled with double speak"

Yep. Here we can see a great example:

<https://archive.is/9OaOd>

Newspeak is also becoming increasingly popular. We see it everywhere. Cis, Micro Aggression, Poly, Pansexual, whatever.

"The goal of Newspeak is to reduce the English language to the fewest words possible and supercede Oldspeak by 2050. Removing words removes ways to define anti-Party feelings and the ability to disagree. For example, the word "speedful" can be used in place of the word "rapid.""

As for removing words, we see it all the time. See the Stanford students that want to make it an actionable offense to use words like "Guy" or "male".

See the (white) people that want to abolish the word black in reference to black men- instead, replacing it with "African American"

offensive, that those people want to qualify and differentiate Black men, who are just Americans like the rest of us, and segregate them as "African Americans".

Incredibly stupid, seeing as how only a small% of American blacks are immigrants from Africa, or have even ever been to Africa.

larryjack • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 09:12 PM

Language control is a very useful tool.

It is somehow an art.

Not everyone is capable to do it.

And most are also not capable to see it as what it is: a twisted mind control tool.

[deleted] • 0 points • 22 September, 2016 05:07 AM

Language (all languages) is home and temple of the game.

Are you the average working joe getting overwhelmed by BP guilt making?

your ass definitely stinks.

Are you Hillary Clinton, a rotten corrupt super rich lady which can give you access to the wonders house?

Well, her ass happens to sport a pleasing, fragrant aromatic essence of dark chocolate.

Same physical reality up their butt, 2 different social (psycho-economic) realities at play.

Once you get it you can't take it personal though, because... it's really not. One must see the game before he has a chance to play it right.

It's the exact same of AF/BB on social terms instead of sexual. Game has many "cuts" or dimensions.

[deleted] • 6 points • 21 September, 2016 04:12 PM

Here at TRP we have the advantage, we are aware that the majority of men are Beta cucks that lack the balls to be dominant. Exploit it, be masculine, treat women like children, get laid.

Holyshitspace • -11 points • 22 September, 2016 06:46 AM

So... you treat women like CHILDREN. And then you want to fuck them. Oook.

SetConsumes • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 04:13 PM

So... you treat women like CHILDREN. And then you want to fuck them. Oook.

Because they act like children and enjoy being treated like such, no demand being treated like such, like delicate egoistic fragile emotionally sensitive animals. Yeah, of course we want to fuck them, they still have value through that slit of theirs.

RickThacker • 6 points • 21 September, 2016 07:06 PM

This is precisely why men are valuable to women, and always will be more valuable than the woman they're with. 1. be physically stronger than your woman. it's your birthright as a testosterone-producer to be physically strong enough to manipulate your environment. 2. women **need** men to function in society. they suffer a worse fate being 30 and unmarried than a man in the same setting. They've usually spent most of their 20s in a world where the only value they added was their youth. Once it's evaporated, what value do they bring to society? Usually, they simply convince some poor bloke he's lucky enough to have them, and the dude spends his hard-won resources keeping her around. But a true man has spent time investing in himself and his social status.. and this social status is the value women wish to harness.. it's just in their nature.

Mckallidon • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 01:04 AM

Is this why I jerk off and cry myself to sleep at night?

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 04:45 PM

TLDR:

In the absence of restrictions and consequences, most women are slutty, lazy, manipulative bitches.

Women can't beat men physically, so they need to reengineer society so that society keeps men weak for them.

So fuck society. Hit the gym, be an aggressive, masculine badass, and bully the hell out of women. You're stronger. They fear you, and the only reason they have any power whatsoever is because we, as men, let them.

Great work as usual Arch. This one hit like a bolt of lightning.

PantsonFire1234 • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 11:25 PM

So you're saying that men actually do have masculine occupations but women aren't naturally inclined toward feminine nurturing?

I don't agree at all, men can be just as lazy, beta and manipulative as women can. The reason why women mostly act like that is because they will get a man anyway, since most are so pussy starved. Sure most will be beta but at least it's something, while men get nothing if they don't put out.

This is the problem with TRP. We put such high expectations towards men and what it means to be off high value and how men should be. And then we forget to hold women to the same standard. TRP believes women are just static things that can't win or lose at life.

We tell men to act Alpha, to up their value and to act out of self interest. Then we follow this up by shaming beta behavior and celebrating achievement. Next we completely forget women can be held by the same standards, allot of ancient civilizations did this.

The reason why women are such worthless low value sluts nowadays is because they are not motivated to do anything. No one holds them to a higher standard, the Alpha that does gives her tingles. Society constantly protects them from reality, our government shields them from any harm (even imaginary) and it's basically PC to be a man hater whilst misogyny is severely punished. So much in fact that women now have to create fake misogyny because there's so little of it going around.

Also the idea that women are promiscuous by nature is pants on head stupid. We know that low testosterone lowers sex drive and we also know estrogen creates more emotional needs.

The idea that women want to flick their bean as badly as men want to wank their rod.. ludicrous. That's why women have a built in advantage, guys don't often have the patience to play the long game because we are hardwired to fuck *right now*. While women can play your for weeks before deciding if you are Alpha enough before they ride your dick.

Women can suck just as much at life like men can. They might have allot of safety nets but that doesn't prevent them from making bad life choices that end up impacting their future.

Don't adhere to the pussy pass.

ashes000000 • 1 points • 24 September, 2016 10:19 PM [recovered]

That's why women have a built in advantage, guys don't often have the patience to play the long game because we are hardwired to fuck right now.

My hormone levels have always been normal, and if you're talking about the way a person will zone out every few minutes throughout the day imagining different sexual scenarios with **everyone**, butterflies from staring at the outline of their curves and bulges, maintaining eye contact with an attractive person as foreplay, taking in their scent ... that's not exclusive to men. I think about sex with all types of people all day. I'm certain that's not special in any way.

PantsonFire1234 • 0 points • 24 September, 2016 11:39 PM

Your a woman? Then why are you on TRP.. sigh another one.

Okay anyway, if you are then I'm fairly certain you have no idea what I'm talking about. I'm a guy and I notice a huge difference in libido and the way I approach sex and women just based of how high my testosterone levels were.

For comparison, when I was on the football team and had to lift weights and eat enough I *needed* to bust a nut every day. My girlfriend would often times half complain half giggle at my libido.

Then when I got kicked off the team for a while I basically quit doing all that and started drinking more heavily with my dad and friends. And I instantly noticed a drop in sex drive, I would still look at girls and imagine things but I wouldn't feel the compulsion to just *do it*. Self control and patience was allot easier.

When I eventually return to playing ball all those things returned to me and I felt like the old me again. Looking back at that slump I can honestly state that testosterone influences male sexuality allot.

Now I have no idea what you're talking about when you say

zone out every few minutes throughout the day imagining different sexual scenarios with **everyone**, butterflies from staring at the outline of their curves and bulges, maintaining eye contact with an attractive person as foreplay, taking in their scent ... that's not exclusive to men. I think about sex with all types of people all day. I'm certain that's not special in any way.

But if you mean that you daydream about guys you are attracted to then I don't think you understood my point. I'm sure you women do but not at the level men do simply because our sex drives are higher.

[deleted] • 4 points • 22 September, 2016 02:00 AM

Man's natural state is also hedonistic. Seeking out short term earthly pleasures like sex (sometimes via rape) excessive drug use, in the modern world-excessive gaming and television, wrapping your life up in some fantasy world whether it's NFL or anime (don't get me wrong, watching sports is fine, but obsessing over it is on another level), gambling.. Or even-sitting on reddit all day. The list goes on.

I would say men working hard to be strong is a result of the foundation of patriarchy, tribe leadership, and masculine governance. In the old days, nobles from house of (insert family name) were trained to be hard warriors to defend their cities and give charity to peasants. Etc..

Think about it, how many guys do you see "naturally" just working to get strong? "naturally" lots of guys are just couch potatoes who won't do shit other than watch tv all day if they don't have to. Or they'll sleep past noon time on a day off.

Having the mindset to get strong, work hard on your career, train hard at a sport or hobby is a gift of masculine leadership. An older alpha minded man teaching young men "the way".

This is one idea at TRP I don't buy into.. I've never heard anyone close to me knock me for going to the gym and making progress. If anything I get a lot of "damn dude you got into good shape!" Same with going crazy with my life goals.. I work like a motherfucker and probably shouldn't even be on reddit right now, but a lot of people close to me are impressed with how far I've come in just a few years.

The only people who hate on me are some jealous losers I used to be friends with who for one reason or another got the idea in their head that I think I'm better than them for some reason. In reality, they're the ones who seemed to stop giving a shit about our friendship.. I just got sick of getting flaked on all the time and being back in school with a very challenging major with heavy course load, I just don't have a lot of free time. I would rather make plans with people who know better not to flake like 30 min before meeting up on a friday night.

Anyone who's hating on your progress is probably a fucking loser and doesn't deserve your time. Level headed people don't knock their friends and loved ones for stepping up to the plate and doing something with their lives.

Strum_Gewehr • 2 points • 21 September, 2016 05:17 PM

Nice read. Though i feel that in the olden days the number of masculine men was high. Even without the rigid social constructs the women would still have submitted to such men. Submissive behavior is attraction based and that cannot be negotiated. Todays men fail to command such behavior. The blame is also on women's education i feel.

soviet_dissident • 2 points • 21 September, 2016 06:13 PM

I would argue that this is because civilizing institutions (i.e., law enforcement, adjudication, etc.) did not have the same reach as they do in modern society. And the welfare state didn't exist to save women from their bad decisions or misfortune.

Therefore, men were protectors. Women still had a very real physical threat as well as a resource-based one (these could arguably be one and the same) and being nice to men was literally a matter of life or death.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 12:23 AM

I think your entire point is borne out in dread game. Women's base natures aren't the traditional housewife platitudes, but put a strong man around and she gets there pretty quick.

I think society has fucked a lot of people up when it comes to telling people they can't do what's natural. You mention the Halo Effect in another comment, I've found that those that doth protest too much (landwhale HAES-advocates or dike man-shamer) are projecting on their insecurities on pet issues - and hate themselves for it. They know being thin is better.

The louder a girl tells you she doesn't need to be thin..... the more she wishes she was thin. Like - desperately wishes.

Tmnsquirtle47 • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:28 AM

Well said. This world sucks, but at least we can do something about it on our end.

NikolaiVuhg • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 07:27 AM

I have a question. How do ethics play in to this? Is it ethical to purposefully make another fear you? Yes, we are stronger, and yes, if we really wanted to we could kill them, we could, but is that ethical? Not necessarily directed at women, but didn't we all sign a social contract saying "I won't harm you and you won't harm me? and that's how we'll thrive." I mean, that's how we as humans have come so far, right?

I had a poor upbringing without a father figure in my life, maybe that's why I am having trouble understanding and internalizing this.. Reading this, I can really relate and it 'feels' right... but in my mind I can't make sense of it. Can anyone give me some more insight?

BluepillProfessor • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 05:36 PM

Hopefully you get that nobody is advocating the top 20% take over, fuck all the women, and abuse the rest of the men. We are saying this is the natural order of nature without social constraints. Currently we have removed all those constraints on women and we see their true nature is slutty, promiscuous, arrogant and unpleasant until forced to shut up by a high value man. The results are in when you remove social/sexual restraints on women.

We are debating what would happen if we removed the social/sexual restraints on men.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 08:25 AM

This reminds me of Kurt Vonnegut's short story "Harrison Bergeron". He describes a world where the government had finally created equality by imposing handicaps on its citizens. If you have a beautiful face you must mask it. If you are athletic and strong then you must wear heavy weights to impede your power. As so forth equality has mandated that no one is special, and that no one has an advantage. Harrison Bergeron is a example of a boy/man who won't let handicaps be pushed on him. /u/archwinger makes an important point about the chains (handicaps) society tries to impose on men and their masculinity don't be tricked in accepting what society says you should be or act as gospel.

stawek • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 10:24 AM

Nah, men are naturally just as lazy as women.

In the past they had no other choice but to work all day in a coalmine, nowadays 8 hours of flipping burgers is enough to afford a room with internet connection and some fast food.

We are animals. Animals don't think about future, they take every pleasure they can now and avoid any pain and effort they can. This is our basic behaviour.

The modern human brain has the capacity to think about the future, but not everyone can act on it. Males and females alike.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:23 PM

They fear you, and the only reason they have any power whatsoever is because we, as men, let them.

That's true, but for some legitimate reasons. It's a contract between men to not fuck with each other's women. By giving women more freedom and power, men benefit from it themselves. You promise you don't rape and kill women in general, so you don't have to worry about your own woman, or your family, not being safe. It's darwinism. Cooperation is more useful than blind selfishness. But of course only alpha men are down to play this game, because they're good enough to attract and keep a good partner non-aggressively. Resentful betas have no problem living in a world where raping and hurting women is fine, because they don't have one to worry about. It's always someone else's or no one's women they fuck with. Never theirs.

Metalgear222 • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 06:26 PM

I've put on 40+ pounds this last year and can't help but notice how women are petrified of me everywhere I go. They don't hold eye contact just like when I was a weakling and their body language is very submissive. Does cold approaching work the same with this dynamic or is there something I should buffer to not be so intimidating all the time?

--Chocobo • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 08:21 PM

Do you think it's really hard to have genuine friendships with women?

Archwinger[S] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 09:37 PM

That depends on what you mean by "genuine friendships".

It's easy as hell to be friendly toward women and to get women to act generally friendly toward you. And to remain in contact with women like that via phone, text, e-mail, social media, and the like and hang out once in awhile.

If you mean some kind of hippie, new-age, blue pill, mutual respect and caring, super duper friend you can count on kind of relationship, then no, you can't count on a woman for that shit.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 06:01 PM

Although it is true that men are physically stronger than women, what gave them leverage over them *within a societal setting* was only the accumulation of resources, aka the agrarian revolution.

Countless studies have shown that hunter-gatherer societies often accommodated the will of its women, they were decision-makers, and they often chose to live in a society that shared resources and was compounded of mostly unrelated individuals (it was a primordial version of globalism). Men did not necessarily love it, because in such a society it was very difficult to establish paternity for certain and the sharing of resources meant that they would provide for other men's children.

So why did they do it? Why did they agree? Because living with women and accommodating them brought its benefits. Unlike what is believed here, women back then did work. A 'working woman' is not a modern invention. 'Domesticity' is a concept invented with the agrarian revolution. It is a luxury. Women were not 'domestic' because there were no houses back then, so they grew vegetables, made cloth etc. They were responsible for bringing in most of the calories because men would not necessarily always bring meat back to them, and were also often just busy fighting wars between them. Women had to survive in groups on their own. There was also a small pool of women who hunted with the men (later they became the so-called 'shieldmaidens' or 'amazons' and they are today's army women).

So not only were women self-sufficient (except for protection), they also lived exactly as they do today: there were single mothers EVERYWHERE, there was promiscuity, and women living in their groups, and working. And sharing resources, and therefore cucking men into providing for children that were not theirs.

Why did men allow such a system? Why did they accept to live in mixed cuck-groups, the hunter-gatherer version of globalism? Because men living alone died, and died like shit. Women made the clothing, cooked, gathered most of the calories. So men, even though nothing socially stopped them from just killing all women or just beating them constantly, did not. They had to do as the women asked.

Patriarchy was only established when men acquired resources, and could therefore afford the luxury to create social constructs such as monogamy to ensure paternity.

The problem of men is that they are very good at destroying, but they suck at creating liveable homely conditions on their own. So they had to accommodate women before patriarchy. And what we have today, far from being unnatural, is a return to the old state of affairs.

[deleted] • 8 points • 21 September, 2016 07:41 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -1 points • 21 September, 2016 07:46 PM

Their wombs kinda made them the non-disposable sex, and that helped them get power. Instead, an individual non-20% man in a hunter gathered culture would not get raped or mistreated, he would get simply killed. Possibly cannibalised.

It is only within an agricultural OR technological society that the weaker men can thrive. So the existence of modern society which grants women freedom is something they like, too. And as I said, men had to listen to the decisions of women before patriarchy, back when they did not have resources and therefore no advantage in society except for brutal strength (which would help them survive, but not live decently).

Archwinger[S] • 14 points • 21 September, 2016 06:05 PM

So men aren't just stronger than women. They're more successful and accrue more resources more readily. And the one thing that scares women even more than being beaten and raped is not having access to men's resources. So we've taken steps to fix that as a society as well. Super.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 06:53 PM

The top 20% of men is better at accumulating resources within a wild setting (which we had in the hunter gatherer society). The advent of technology turned the tables entirely because now even someone like Hawkins (definitely NOT in the top 20%) and women can contribute to society in resources. It was all thanks to technology. Also, accumulating resources still did not mean men could *make* things the way women made cloth etc.

Patriarchy began when men accumulated resources *and therefore did not need to be in the top 20% category to survive anymore*. If you owned land and had a fat beta son, he would be advantaged. That was patriarchy, the advantage of one sex over the other, no matter how useless the men, made possible not through nature (the fat son would have died in the wild), but through accumulated resources.

Nowadays we are actually far closer to the normal state of affairs because women work, as they did back in the day, and the top 20% of men has acquired status again (in the past they did not necessarily have any advantage over the rich fat kid with accumulated resources).

Archwinger[S] • 10 points • 21 September, 2016 07:53 PM

This is actually a really interesting point. If we dropped humanity on an island with scarce resources, the strongest 20% of men would enslave the remaining 80% of men and make blankets out of the skin of any men that resisted. The strongest 20% of men would then fuck 100% of the women, while whatever portion of the remaining 80% of men that weren't gutted would keep their heads down, know their place, and work hard just to survive.

Essentially, what you're saying is that even today, in luxurious modern times with abundant resources, the bottom 80% of men need to know their place. They exist by the grace of society, without which they would be made into blankets for the stronger men. And it's unearned entitlement for any of that bottom 80% to expect sex or attention from women -- maybe back in the olden days when religion and the patriarchal social order forced women to fuck these guys, that could happen, but not today. Today, those 80% of men need to know their place. Suck it up, jerk off to porn, enjoy some beer and video games, watch some TV, do their jobs, and quit acting like they're entitled to women. That era is over.

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 08:02 PM

You pretty much nailed it.

Of course, our technological society gives rights to both the 80% of men and women because the only society you can sustain if only the top 20% of men are in power is, well, a hunter gatherer one.

RedEyesBlueShades • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 07:14 AM

In other words, we made a giant step back in terms of civilisational advance - From a state where both male and female natural instincts were contained, to a state where female instincts are free to rear it's ugly head. But male instincts are still mainly constrained.

Hello feminism.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 07:35 AM

Male sexual instincts were not contained within a patriarchal society. That's what brothels were for.

There is a lot of hamstering in this sub regarding what 'female nature' is because on one side it is acknowledged that what we see today is natural, unshackled female behaviour,

yet on the other some here keep hamstering that 'feminine nature' is about loving one beta in a lifetime, wanting to be a virgin for him and taking immense pleasure from cooking his dinner, rearing his children, and sucking him off (NO amount of 'frame' could keep that woman in such a state forever, especially once children and marital finances are involved).

The hamstering kind of falls apart when you take a look at how women are now free to do as they like and yeah, that does not look like their true nature, does it?

I mean... if women were 'naturally' like that then why would you discuss hypergamy and why would you need societal norms to make them act like that? The fact is that this 'feminine' nature is a male construct, it's what men would like women to be. It's understandable, but it's not realistic.

Women nowadays are encouraged to do as they like, there is no actual feminazi police ordering them around, other than telling them to do as they please. How many of them have, in this natural state, chosen to be a 'unicorn'? That tells you how 'natural' being a unicorn is.

kolluminko • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 02:34 PM*

opinions like yours are rare on this sub and i very much enjoy thinking about them. you should make a thread about the biological truth and heritage of female nature here

RedEyesBlueShades • 1 point • 5 November, 2016 10:21 PM

Late reply...

Agree with you on most, except the first paragraph. It is pretty entertaining to observe sometimes how the guys on here believe in men-centric fairy tales, and hamster away.

The patriarchy was, whether intentionally or not, a way to contain sexual instincts. My gut is telling me our ancients kinda figured out the sexuality beast, of both sexes!, pretty well and the patriarchy was a way to contain both. Would not even be too surprised if that was the principal reason for introducing it.

Brothels were some sort of unspoken, tacit way of admitting male sexuality is more "dangerous", and requires further release. Dangerous in the sense that a sexless man is a lot more aggressive than a sexless woman. Also keep in mind that not everyone would go to brothels, hence my phrasing it as "further" release.

In one fell swoop, the Patriarchy that is, you achieve the goal of pacifying both men and women's sexual instincts, and having a (more) peaceful society.

BluepillProfessor • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 05:28 PM

THIS is the point people are missing.

Marriage was the entire key to civilization. We swung in the trees and were Hunter-Gatherers for hundreds of thousands of years. Even MILLIONS of years, wandering the forests and foraging. Then suddenly agriculture and the social institution to support it (marriage) was formed. 10,000 years later we conquer the atom, build mile high structures, and explore the universe.

Now the plan is to go back to a Hunter-Gatherer type of social structure? Sure, let me know how that all works out for you.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 08:54 AM

You have been watching the movie 300s for too long, mate. The strongest 20% of men would enslave the other 80% with what? Brute physical strength? So each of the top 20% male is a superman? Are you advocating eugenics? You a nazi, mate?

80% of men need to know their place. They exist by the grace of society, without which they would be made into blankets for the stronger men. And it's unearned entitlement for any of that bottom 80% to expect sex or attention from women -- maybe back in the olden days when religion and the patriarchal social order forced women to fuck these guys, that could happen, but not today. Today, those 80% of men need to know their place. Suck it up, jerk off to porn, enjoy some beer and video games, watch some TV, do their jobs, and quit acting like they're entitled to women. That era is over.

You gotta explain to me then why do I see so many young men who are scrawny and have attractive girlfriends while having no money of note. You thinking about the bottom 20%, not 80% lmao if women only fucked the top 20% there would be a lot more suicides and crime going on.

How's middle-age life treating ya?

TheRedChemist • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 09:56 AM

You're looking at it way too simplistically and literally. The top 20% thing is not based purely on one category like looks or strength.

In the desert island example, the top 20% are the guys with the social skills to command the respect and following of the rest of the community, probably backed up with enough physical ability to look after himself in any confrontations and lead by example at the physical tasks. He's the top 20%, and he effectively enslaves the lower 80% - he directs the future of the group, the others are following his will, but they're happy about it, because most people are sheep in need of strong leadership.

You see scrawny penniless young guys being successful with women because their SMV is higher in other areas, normally socially (example, plays in a band).

Lo-G • 2 points • 22 September, 2016 12:04 AM

It is a luxury. Women were not 'domestic' because there were no houses back then, so they grew vegetables, made cloth etc. They were responsible for bringing in most of the calories because men would not necessarily always bring meat back to them, and were also often just busy fighting wars between them. Women had to survive in groups on their own.

Cite me a reputable source on this. Proving that it was exclusively or at least only a vast majority of women doing this work.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 03:57 AM

<http://hunter-gatherers.org/what-hunter-gatherers-eat.html>

I quote: 'Some have said that the typical equality of women found in h-g groups owes to the fact that women actually bring to the group more food and more calories than the men in most h-g societies. There is great importance attached to hunting, and meat is desired by all and is important for general nutrition, but it seems that the men only infrequently, maybe once or twice in a week, go hunting, while women forage daily and do the cooking.'

But isn't this obvious? Men mostly killed each other, they did not even live with women all the time.

Also note that the sharing of food is an underlined concept, as was the fact that the individual man who occasionally brought the meat was not praised (so as it to cause resentment among the other men). It was pretty much nowadays'society. Do you get praised for paying your taxes? And yet your taxes are shared by the community and do a lot, don't they?

So this shows us that the system of male competition was only established when men actually managed to get enough of an advantage in terms of resources to establish a society based on competition rather than sharing. Competition was important to men for a reason: in the hunter gatherer society in which women insisted on sharing resources, they provided for other men's children and they were *never* certain of paternity (reason why women wanted such a society in the first place).

Man_Jose • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 11:22 PM

The problem of men is that they are very good at destroying, but they suck at creating liveable homely conditions on their own. So they had to accommodate women before patriarchy. And what we have today, far from being unnatural, is a return to the old state of affairs.

I believe you are writing this little bit of text on a computer, an invention 'created' by men.

Men create....but only to maintain order and only because they care about their tribe. If women all of a sudden decide to be disloyal to these men, these men do not feel like supporting these women. They'd rather stop working non stop, everyday to create the car that you use to drive around and buy your nail-polish (again created by man)

mo_reece • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 07:27 PM

I've noticed that even men who claim to be red pillled change or clam up when women are around. They feed off of the reaction.

I don't do this. Consequently, I have difficulty in the workplace as they're constantly trying to trap me. I found at my last job that it's completely acceptable to make fun of a man who eats right, works out, and spends his time with his family.

I don't bully women or advocate for it, but I certainly don't play their games or play along. It gets me no where with them, which is exactly where I'm trying to get since I'm happily married to an awesome one.

Expectations1 • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 09:01 PM

Im so sick of corporate life, even the CEO of the company has to tippy toe around women and be vomitingly politically correct. Makes me want to say fk it and become a mechanic or tradesman so i can hang with the boys and talk like a man.

askmrca • 2 points • 21 September, 2016 10:42 PM

I work at a software company and my company bent over backwards for women. Nearly our entire HR staff is women. There are 6 high executive HR managers. There is absolutely no reason to have that many, but we do and they all get paid very well for it.

We have two guys that work in HR, want to know what they do? Data analytics. You know the only position that actually requires critical thinking.

We also don't have dress code. Women push this a little too far. Now my perverted side don't mind this, but my corporate side do. Women wearing yoga pants, short shorts, flip flops, ect...

It's like cmon, you're at work, yet you all want to dress in a way where you are pretty much provoking a sexual harassment lawsuit.

This is a small rant, but just wanted to explain how companies like mine caters to women

Expectations1 • 2 points • 21 September, 2016 11:29 PM

Yeh and you are the devil for saying a single thing about the dress code too, I once jokingly called out a female co worker about wearing what was basically something you sleep in to work, theb got blasted by her (luckily on instant messenger not in the open) for it too. Women want it both ways in the workplace, they want to be treated like a queen and get priviliges when it suits them, at the same time be seen as an important holder of responsibility and title.

BluepillProfessor • 3 points • 22 September, 2016 05:39 PM

It's almost like they are children or something who need to be told "no."

Vasallo7G • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 09:50 PM

It's a well-intended society that wants everyone to be happy

check out "the gervais principle" asap, or you are in for some hard life lessons

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 September, 2016 10:30 PM*

The only reason women have any power at all is because men play along

Couldn't agree more.

Modern feminism is macro shit test used by women to weed out weak men during a period of relative female abundance. The U.S. ratio of men to women is at the highest point since the First World War, so women have more leverage in the sexual marketplace and have used their power to increase barriers to entry for pussy. The men who overcome these obstacles created by feminism are the ones considered worthy to fuck.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 01:19 AM

1) Savage post; spot on.

2) I had a conversation with my feminist ex-roommate about how society began to decay after women got the vote. My point was that above all else, men ALLOWED women to vote, women never fought and won anything. She couldn't get the fact that the only way the physically weaker sex was able to get the vote was through emotional manipulation, not actually fighting or producing a logical argument. //This was in my early RP days where I felt sharing my RP truths with others was a good idea.

Wokiip • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 08:57 AM

How did it go. What was her reaction

[deleted] • 0 points • 21 September, 2016 08:23 PM

So fuck society. Hit the gym, be an aggressive, masculine badass, and **bully the hell out of women.**

Bully people that are weaker than you? I think you lost me there, my brother.

ThatHoeOverDere[] • 3 points • 21 September, 2016 10:39 PM

Its a woman you would be bullying, though, so it's okay. It would be unfair to bully a man weaker than you, however, as it used to be/is in schools.

Temperfuelmma • 1 point • 22 September, 2016 05:19 AM

Bully people that are weaker than you? I think you lost me there, my brother.

You would rather bully people people that are stronger than you?

ecosci • 0 points • 21 September, 2016 09:13 PM

We have to love the fact that women get away with bad choices and behaviours it allows us to see thier true nature which will run its course because betas are catching on daily and will hurt society you cant get chid support,ailomony and medical benefits from smart wealthy to average income men who refuse to be farthers and husbands.

[deleted] • 0 points • 22 September, 2016 10:40 AM

The natural state of males is aggression.

This isn't true. Violence does not equate to manliness, and neither does aggression. Asserting yourself is manly. Violence is asserting yourself without respecting other people, and respect is the cornerstone of society, of civilization.

Society isn't just anti-red pill. Society is anti-masculinity. Society doesn't want you to be a strong, successful, confident badass. Society wants you to be a woman, because if you act like a man, women are afraid of you.

Civilization is the only thing that's keeping men from killing each other within anarchy. Contemporary western society may not be ideal, but it is not something to be abolished entirely, or even ignored.

So fuck society. Hit the gym, be an aggressive, masculine badass, and bully the hell out of women. You're stronger. They fear you, and the only reason they have any power whatsoever is because we, as men, let them.

Men should lead women and be their leaders. We shouldn't bully them or hate them, in the same way a general of an army keeps his men under control and in check to assert his dominance and authority, but he doesn't hate his men or even disrespect them. Of course, if they're doing something worthy of disrespect then it becomes okay to do so. Again, bullying women doesn't make you a leader or dominant one over them similar to the way that bullying a hunting dog doesn't make you it's owner. You're right that men should be the leaders of men and shouldn't give that power to incapable women. If you want to just fuck them and move on than I guess this doesn't apply though.