

TRP.RED Live-update thread for the US presidential debate: **#FirstDebate**

57 upvotes | 26 September, 2016 | by redpillschool

[#FirstDebate](#)

As the rules plainly state, we're not a political sub, and we're steering clear of having the sub or users endorse a candidate one way or another.

However, that doesn't mean the presidential race doesn't affect a number of our US members, and that doesn't mean there won't be a red-pill perspective to take with the debates coming up.

If you're interested in sharing your thoughts on the debate tonight, or want to read others' red-pill perspectives on the debate tonight, join our live update thread on TRP.RED:

[#FirstDebate](#)

I will personally be weighing in as the night goes on, and I'm sure many of you will want to as well. Anybody's welcome to join the discussion, just use the hashtag [#FirstDebate](#).

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

zedsdedforever • 51 points • 26 September, 2016 09:25 PM

Regardless of who becomes president, we have a growing geopolitical situation happening in the middle east and the pacific. There is no war with Russia to come because of the issues they are also facing with the middle east. The biggest question I want answered is who is gonna be the big bull in the global playground instead of this pussyfooting that has been happening. While you guys say enjoy the decline, a big ass war is slowly brewing and seeing my friends and myself having to go fight in another one isn't appealing. I want to keep on fucking instead of shooting some asshole I don't give two shits about.

p00pey • 19 points • 26 September, 2016 10:07 PM

Wars are inevitable regardless of who wins this election. You know that already, come on. The world is overpopulated, resources are dwindling, and collectively we're not dealing with the real issues. Eventually, wars will intensify, and the haves, aka us with the biggest guns, will destroy the have nots. We're in too deep to reverse this trajectory. Best bet is to get the fuck out the way, aka get out of the military. Enjoy the fucking, we'll all be dead soon...

smokecheck1976 • 25 points • 27 September, 2016 04:10 AM

The solar system, hell the galaxy, has plenty of resources. As near as we can tell the place is full of useful rocks. It's time that we invest the energy and resources into our ability to exploit what is a nearly unlimited supply of almost every resource imaginable.

good_guy_submitter • 8 points • 27 September, 2016 06:37 AM

So instead of killing people, we should be exporting them to Mars and Titan. Sounds good to me.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 03:08 PM

I want to export the freaking liberals and crazy feminists that are infecting not just the US, but the world.

zedsdedforever • 10 points • 27 September, 2016 12:42 AM

Your right, it is inevitable. The difference is war or a conflict. I'll take a couple thousand deaths over millions. This may be me just being a bitch about the situation, but I don't believe Marcus Aurelius looked at his empire with its problems and said fuck it, just as I see the problems now and say well fuck it. My fellow man may look at his surroundings with a blue pill lens, but you don't leave your brothers behind. We don't hold their hands through every problem, but we don't abandon them.

good_guy_submitter • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 06:39 AM

In the land of the blind, the one eyed man is king. None of us are perfect, but if we've swallowed the pill we can at least see enough to lead our fellow man out of this spiral of destruction. I for one want a better world for my children and their children. I will become a leader of men. The more blue pill they are the easier they are to lead, just show them compassion instead of disgust.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 09:08 PM

Ever heard the saying people get the rulers they deserve? It is pretty much too late.

zedsdedforever • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 09:26 PM

I guess this is my beef with trp brothers. The defeatist (free) line of thinking of the US falling reminds me of what Charles Manson was after.

JohnnyRaz • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 09:01 PM

While most of the things you listed are true, they're nothing in comparison to those few evil unmentionables that start and fund the wars.

Zachar1a • 3 points • 28 September, 2016 01:17 AM **[recovered]**

The Middle East, not so much. ISIS is constantly shrinking and might evaporate by next year sometime. There will always be Islamic extremists, but they won't have a state sponsor. Even the Saudis have come clean and admitted that they have sponsored Islamists in the past, but that it wasn't a good idea because of how it turned out. Iran's supreme leader just forbid Ahmadinejad from running for President again, leaving the moderate incumbent without a serious contender. But most of all, the USA is becoming the world's largest oil producer, giving us less reason to care about the Middle East.

China is a whole other story, however.

kagetsuki23 • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 12:34 PM

civil wars is what will happen. riches vs poors and race war, in particular in the case of europe migrants.

bowie747 • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 09:56 PM

Class warfare. We're already seeing the beginnings of it with the Western globalism vs nationalism divide (Brexit, Trump).

Original_Dankster • -1 points • 28 September, 2016 01:29 PM

We defeat ISIS, and their membership disperses throughout the western world. Personally, I'd prefer a strategy to contain ISIS - rather than a defeat ISIS. Let them have their caliphate, and then close it off, monitor it, and put a massive conventional / nuclear deterrent nearby - just as we do with North Korea.

edwardhwhite • 5 points • 27 September, 2016 06:17 PM

Russia is a big danger because they are hurting. Their economy is now smaller than Spain's. They are covering budget shortfalls with currency reserves and will be out of FOREX reserves by January.

This makes folks engage in risky moves.

zedsdedforever • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 08:33 PM

If you watch Putin's interviews, you will see his view on the middle east. All the US vs Russia stuff is smoke and mirrors. He needs our alliance to assist with his muslim problem. Big monster is ISIS and anything left in the power vacuum when Saddam was killed. Second monster is China, but that is a slow battle behind the scenes. We are purely talking the big game players at a tactical level.

edwardhwhite • 8 points • 28 September, 2016 02:50 AM

Russia's in deep shit. They are running out of money. Oil is at record lows. Every country keeps reserves of foreign currencies. You have them so you can do transactions. Russia is so economically weak that they raided those funds just to keep the government going. They spent down 18% of their foreign exchange funds in 1 month.

true_detective_sf • 1 points • 29 September, 2016 09:43 PM [recovered]

In 10 years half the car/truck fleet will be electric and fracking will be far more efficient. I think we'll see oil drop below \$20 / barrel at that point and Russia will be in very, very deep trouble.

edwardhwhite • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 10:11 PM

They are in deep shit now.

Russia 'could run out of cash reserves over the next year'

People do not realize how much the sanctions are fucking them up because they only pay attention to what Putin says or the latest provocation from the Russian government. They spent 18% of their FOREX reserves last month. In 5 months they will be out of reserves entirely. Then they raid pension funds. When that happens and pensions go down, Putin will be out in a month or it will be World War III.

Mckallidon • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 03:43 AM

Time to pull out balls out the purse.

BlueFreedom420 • 3 points • 28 September, 2016 02:00 AM

There is a shadow war. Waged by all nation states against each other. People die in this war. All nations states will deny it's existence. The trouble in the middle east is a smoke screen. The earth cannot survive western style consumerism, and the nation states know this.

dogextraordinaire • 93 points • 27 September, 2016 02:50 AM

I genuinely believe (political leanings aside) that this debate was perfect evidence of the importance of maintaining frame.

Trump, for once, was forced onto the back foot and shows us how pathetic one looks when being defensive while drawn into another person's frame (this coming from a Brit who doesn't really hold an opinion on their respective politics).

Momo_dollar • 43 points • 27 September, 2016 05:30 AM

Exactly what I thought, especially at the moment when he started talking really fast. Also, Hilary's reactions once Trump was on the back foot were perfect she didn't get annoyed at him interrupting, lots of amused mastery etc.

[deleted] • 26 points • 27 September, 2016 12:08 PM

The fact that we saw Amused Mastery only from Hillary and not from the Donald who is famous for it really surprised me.

Hillary many times started her two minutes with a short ridicule of the stuff Trump just said instead of defending herself. That was Amused Mastery from the textbook.

disposable_pants • 17 points • 27 September, 2016 04:55 PM

Hillary many times started her two minutes with a short ridicule of the stuff Trump just said instead of defending herself. That was Amused Mastery from the textbook.

Also note how this makes responding to the criticism sound even less reasonable. If she had thrown a bunch of little jabs at the end of her statements, it would have been easier and more natural sounding for Trump to counterpunch at the start of his time. Instead, by throwing a quick jab and then talking

policy for 90 seconds, she made Trump look petty and uninterested in policy if he opened with a rebuttal of the attack.

edwardhwhite • 17 points • 27 September, 2016 01:30 PM

Its because he has low frame. Constantly rises to the bait. Can't control himself.

Zacharla • 3 points • 28 September, 2016 01:10 AM [recovered]

I agree, but do you have any examples from the debate?

edwardhwhite • 5 points • 28 September, 2016 02:47 AM

Every time he interrupted her with "wrong" and "not true." She owned him and he could not control himself.

Mr_Andry • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 03:45 PM

I am so fucking happy that some people in this sub are finally recognizing that Drumpf is not alpha. He's a privileged, coddled, stuffed shirt and always has been. Shit talking bully is NOT alpha, though I understand why it might trick some observers occasionally.

perfidiousfish • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 10:12 PM

That was Amused Mastery from the textbook.

The Joker's textbook maybe. Amused mastery can't be obviously faked like it was with her, otherwise it just comes off as creepy.

that_star_wars_guy • 63 points • 27 September, 2016 03:31 AM

how pathetic one looks when being defensive while drawn into a person's frame.

If there is one thing we can agree on, it's that Clinton was excellent at maintaining frame and drawing Trump into her frame throughout the debate.

_Ronaldo • 10 points • 27 September, 2016 12:57 PM [recovered]

A good example of this was at the beginning when Hilary baited Trump about receiving a loan when he first began.

madethewrongmistake • 15 points • 27 September, 2016 06:16 PM

If you've ever had PR training, Clinton was pretty much following the beginner rules of never discuss specifics, always go back to rehearsed talking points. Trump was very specific, very extemporaneous, as he always is.

Here's what I don't get: why are people drawn to politicians with meaningless talking points rather than people that talk specifics and at least try to address the complexities of real problems?

Recognizing frame is one thing, but it's really a small part of being a leader. We criticize leaders based on frame, but many got where they are with terrible frame.

bornredd • 5 points • 28 September, 2016 06:40 PM*

I found that Trump would reference "I could give you a whole list right now" but would focus in on one particular (often incorrect in details) case study. Instead, he should have been discussing trends, which are more applicable in a broad based discussion like a presidential debate.

madethewrongmistake • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 11:27 PM

Trump had a fair bit to say about stats and trends, although maybe overshadowed by anecdotes. Hillary's totally unsubstantiated projections about saving jobs etc was infuriating to me. Admittedly I feel the same way about Trump's 'secret' ISIS plan*. Voters should expect that things will be explained in plain language.

*Side note: ISIS/Mexican gangs/etc are a very predictable result of mass emigration. So, taking refugees/illegal immigrants is about the worst thing we can do for the world. So his stance on immigration is actually good enough for me.

cashcow1 • 4 points • 27 September, 2016 07:53 PM

why are people drawn to politicians with meaningless talking points rather than people that talk specifics and at least try to address the complexities of real problems?

Most women have great difficulty thinking rationally and concretely about public policy.

Many men do as well, because they have not been taught critical thinking skills by our dogshit education system.

madethewrongmistake • 2 points • 29 September, 2016 11:08 PM

I agree it's dogshit, but if anything, it takes education to prevent rational thinking.

[deleted] • 16 points • 27 September, 2016 12:30 PM

the only good moment Trump had was the TPP question which made Hillary backpeddle and fumble quite a bit.

The rest of the debate looked as staged as WWE wrestling. especially since most the questions favored Hillary's narrative, like the one about Obama's nationality.

JillyPolla • 13 points • 27 September, 2016 11:14 PM

I disagree. That cyber security question was as soft as a ball can be for Trump to rip Hillary for her emails. Yet he decided to talk about his son's computer skill instead.

Wilreadit • 5 points • 28 September, 2016 11:06 AM

True. He could have made a direct statement that when it comes to cyber security the biggest threat USA had was Hillary Clinton. She poked him with Putin. He did not react the way I had wanted.

cashcow1 • 4 points • 27 September, 2016 07:54 PM

the only good moment Trump had was the TPP question which made Hillary backpeddle and fumble quite a bit.

I disagree. I think he won the first 3rd, where he really nailed her on being an establishment hack and a criminal. Then it fell apart.

bornredd • 5 points • 27 September, 2016 08:56 PM

Did you really expect the subject of birtherism to not be levied by the moderator? Especially given that Trump was *the primary* propagator of that movement?

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 09:31 PM

I expected all the worse to come. I was hoping this debate would end up more like Alex Jones vs Piers Morgan, but it ended up with Trump being made to look like a limp dick.

bornredd • 6 points • 27 September, 2016 09:44 PM

Trump didn't prepare. He took "boundless confidence" too far, and didn't do the work. He's paying for it in the public perception of him right now.

Zachar1a • 9 points • 28 September, 2016 01:13 AM [recovered]

That "boundless confidence" looks a lot like narcissism.

bornredd • 3 points • 28 September, 2016 06:41 PM

In Trump's case, I believe you are 100% correct. He was unable to back down from any perceived insult to his own detriment.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 05:19 PM

He might come back. Remember, Romney destroyed Obama in the first debate.

bornredd • 4 points • 28 September, 2016 06:37 PM

He might, but I'm pretty sure his inability to ignore jabs is too deeply ingrained to overcome before the next debate and Clinton has his number.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 06:43 PM

Probably. We're screwed either way.

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 September, 2016 03:08 PM

Honestly, this debate was such in favor of Clinton, that it was hard for Trump to maintain frame. Also notice how many times the moderator interrupted Trump vs. Clinton. Trump was interrupted way more.

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 September, 2016 09:04 PM

That said, Trump definitely wasn't ready for this debate. He had lack of preparation as he may have underestimated Hillary. I was honestly expecting Trump to win before the debate began and I think he expected to win too. Well, here is to hoping for a better debate the next time around when Trump actually knows what he is up against.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 09:07 PM

Yeah, as much as I want Trump to win and absolutely hate Clinton, he did look rattled. Whether it's because of the fact Clinton knew questions beforehand, it being slanted in her behavior, or Trump underestimating her, she looked better.

But believe me, next debate, Trump will do better and be more prepared.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 09:33 PM

I believe it is closer to the fact that, if both were unprepared, Trump would win. He believed there was no way for Hillary to get the upper hand and she would be too "weak" personality wise to do so.

But yes, looking forward to the next debate. Though, if Trump doesn't trump Hillary then, he does not deserve to be president. He would have no excuses at that point.

bornredd • 18 points • 27 September, 2016 04:35 PM

Trump was interrupting way more, so this stands to reason.

Hard to get bitched at for interrupting when you're standing there looking smug as fuck.

rubenbrasil • -8 points • 27 September, 2016 11:55 PM

He interrupted whenever she said an outright lie. He had to debunk it before the millions of brainwashed voters eat that shit up. It was a good strategy on her end but if Trump didnt interrupt her by saying "Wrong" then that would be misinterpreted as the truth.

It was honestly smart on Clintons end, and it was basically a trap, being aided by the moderator.

Whatever. Shit happens but people are just looking for reasons to celebrate seeing Trump "implode." They dont understand that systematically, it was built to be unfair i.e. biased moderator, Hillary knowing the answers ahead of time, etc. If you disagree then look at what happened with Sanders. Every subtle factor whether the MSM or debate judges or delegates or donors or shills all favor Hillary and create a VERY slanted playing field by debate. Fuck the establishment.

All shit aside, majority polls are indicating that he won, soooo i guess thats all that matters.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

rubenbrasil • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 03:43 AM

Its all we have though. Are you going to say tremendous rally turnouts and breaking historic primary records dont count either? Dont worry bout that, because come November 9th you will be the butthurt one lol

Strike48 • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 04:19 AM [recovered]

It's like a father's boy just hanging on to the last bit of clothing that he's able to grasp as the alcoholic loser daddy abandons him. I'll humor you big boy. We'll see on the 9th.

RemindMe! 7 weeks

Wilreadit • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 11:04 AM

That was a good moment. Also when he blamed her for being in power for 30 years and not having done anything. That took her by a surprise. And it felt genuine from Trump's part.

Mc_G4rn4gl3 • 20 points • 27 September, 2016 08:26 AM

This was an incredibly "Clinton-sided" forum for debate, and while Trump didn't do himself any favors, the mediator and the quite a bit of the audience was for sure on team Hillary.

Hillary still managed to fuck it up a little bit, by looking so goddamn smug about it. Tilted me soo much when she said "Just listen to what he said!" (paraphrase) and it got some laughs. Bit of a joke the entire debate I thought

redpillschool[S] • 21 points • 27 September, 2016 01:22 PM

It's a very common liberal debate tactic: outrage and indignation.

Common arguments are:

Really?

Do you hear what you just said?

It's [current year]...

I'm not even going to touch this one...

MarriedTRP • 6 points • 28 September, 2016 04:23 PM

This 100%, but Trump should have been ready for that. Donald Jr should have read /pol a little more closely and got his dad ready for these traps.

She did have a script though that she kept reading from: <https://imgur.com/gallery/WxsAR>

BlueBlus • 0 points • 29 September, 2016 02:55 AM

Its not really cheating (based on what the caption of your image says). Im assuming they allowed Trump and Clinton some notes to have when debating eachother. Trump just wasn't as prepared and should prepare a lot more for the next debate as well as maintain frame

ThereAndBlackAgain • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 03:53 AM

Don't forget their absolute favourite, the "Sarcastic Paraphrase". A form of shaming in which not only is a strawman created, but instead of being argued against it's just mocked. It's especially beloved the more social justicy a group gets, with places like tumblr and ShitRedditSays essentially spending all day crafting low-effort non arguments in this form.

edwardhwhite • -1 points • 27 September, 2016 06:16 PM

The audience was cheering Trump.

heelface • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 05:59 PM

Where can I read more about framing? (New to group somewhat overwhelmed by the amount of material).

McPhatness • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 06:08 PM

Read the sidebar, it's a lot of material but that's the place to start when you're new here.

jdino • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 07:49 PM

its when the catcher tries to put the ball into the strike zone fast enough that the ump calls a ball a strike.
watch Molina

heelface • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 08:30 PM

Which one you didn't name that Molina

jdino • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 08:32 PM

my bad, Yadi of course.

he's not the best at framing pitches of course but he is probably the best catcher around...next to my beautiful Salvy.

i was also making a joke. but baseball is great

p00pey • 58 points • 26 September, 2016 09:08 PM

There will be no war with Russia morons, stop talking nonsense seriously. Stop reading retard websites

logicalthinker1 • 25 points • 27 September, 2016 03:14 AM

Correct because there's too much to lose on either side. There will just be posturing and shoving but nothing will happen. But if Russia doesn't see pushback, they're going to keep pushing their luck to see where our true line in the sand is.

The biggest threat is the degradation of our culture from the inside. It has happened to every great empire and it will happen to us.

BlueFreedom420 • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 02:02 AM

We are at war with them right now. How naive to think wars are troops lined up shooting each other.

NeoreactionSafe • 11 points • 27 September, 2016 02:51 AM*

I disagree.

Ignorance is no way to operate. Rather than ignore information that you think is uncomfortable it's better to learn everything and then decide.

Being unaware of reality isn't the answer. (that's precisely how the Blue Pill is configured)

A World War Three is in the plan and always has been.

The Globalist Tyranny isn't going to get this far and then say:

"Oh gee... this quest for absolute power has gotten so boring. Let's stop this long process and pick flowers instead."

P.S: Unless you are not paying attention the Russians are taking the threat very seriously as they know full well what the Globalist Tyranny has in mind. Ignorance is no utopia. However, just because you are wise to what is actually happening doesn't mean you have much control over it.

So some decide ***Ignorance is Bliss***.

Living a life where you ignore the unpleasant truths is much easier.

StoicCrane • 6 points • 27 September, 2016 06:55 AM

I disagree. Ignorance is **comfortable**. This corresponds perfectly with femcentric society. Women are hardwired to pursue self-gratification and comfort so it can be said that any male resistant to the experience of developing character through hardship is effeminate or Beta at heart.

In order to develop and progress towards enlightenment one must find peace in the heart of reality and discomfort. Complacency through comfort is a miserably difficult existence by contrast. Beneath the veil of bliss lies a valley of emptiness.

NeoreactionSafe • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 02:02 PM

Yeah you got my point exactly.

Women ride the:

Hamster Wheel of Subjective Happiness and Progress

...and while that gives great feelz it doesn't make you have Knowledge of Truth.

--Chocobo • -1 points • 27 September, 2016 04:20 PM

It's painful. Anyway not all women. I'm a woman and it's disgustingly obvious that Hillary is using the "Woman Card" to have empathetic and yet vague and pointless answers not rooted in reality.

NeoreactionSafe • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 02:41 PM

If it weren't for the media that distorts reality to serve the interests of the Globalist Tyranny I'd guess that Hillary would be behind by 20 points or more.

Essentially the entire system tries to keep the Blue Pill mythology alive and they manipulate us all the time.

But the whole **global** mythology is cracking.

This includes the biggest scam on earth which is Fractional Reserve Banking through the Central Banks. Once that cracks all kinds of shit will break loose. (making 2007 seem small)

Then expect a World War Three as a distraction.

The goal is a prison planet.

The reason men are less attractive to you now it that these Globalist psychopaths are turning the men into mindless beta slave drones. It's no wonder they are disgusting to you. (I don't blame you)

How can men and women wake up and ever be on the same page again?

--Chocobo • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 03:56 PM

That's nice of you NeoreactionSafe - to not assume that they cannot. I would like to think we can. I think it's a HUMAN quality naturally to strive for intelligence, hence curiosity and playfulness. And unfortunately in this day and age women take advantage of men's beta state. Everyone is just trying to "get by". This is why I hate the blue pill, it slowly puts people into subservience by having them say "This is okay...no, this is great, it could always be -WORSE-" (because god forbid, struggling and pushing against the status quo because you DEMAND things be better is offensive), and then justifying their inaction.

The insane state of money is mind-blowing. When you hear of companies making BILLIONS of dollars and about the complete SHIT working conditions of factories overseas, it's insane to think that NAFTA or TPP weren't inspired by the ones pulling the fucking strings. That's why the espionage act is such bullshit, it is a way to put anyone going against "National interest" whatever the fuck that is (terrorism, if you are 16 or younger you have grown up in a world that has never NOT had this word), into solitary confinement(i.e, torture). Not that I am okay with ISIS, dichotomy is the virus of true logic. I am pro military sure, I believe in law and order, but I AM NOT for a military that is abused by powers acting for their OWN welfare. As for the global mythology. The younger generation feels this. That's why Bernie was such a huge success even though the media gave him 0 coverage. I have hope that we are waking up. But...we'll see. TRUMP WON ALL THE POLLS BESIDES CNN. ;)

NeoreactionSafe • -1 points • 28 September, 2016 04:16 PM

The key for all of us is to understand the Game the Blue Pill plays upon us.

That's the entry point for the Red Pill in that males (who are normally clueless about Game) begin to realize the level of manipulation going on and we typically start in the intimate sexual theater where boys are most fixated at that stage.

Later we broaden the knowledge of Game to a wider and wider scope until we see the manipulation of the media itself.

You might try viewing a few David Icke videos if you already haven't.

--Chocobo • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 09:04 PM

Hmm. I looked up more about David Icke and it looks like he seems to discredit the questioning of power by having some pretty bizarre alien conspiracy theories later in his life. It is one thing to link real occurrences and another to go to that level where the dots are pretty out there.

zedsdedforever • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 10:28 PM

Lol NRS promotes this guy. "Connect the dots"

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 01:11 PM

David Icke is definitely not for the beginner.

zedsdedforever • 4 points • 27 September, 2016 04:44 AM

So what's the solution? More rhetoric?

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 02:03 PM

The answer is to absorb Knowledge.

Increase your data points.

Then using **free will** connect the dots.

It's called "Free Thinking"... something few do these days.

--Chocobo • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 04:08 PM

Nice point NeoreactionSafe. This presidential debate is painful. Bernie was my only hope, now I'm not sure who to vote for. Trump is not completely bought, but I'm probably going to vote 3rd party. (Jill Stein) The U.S is an imperial nation, installing "democracy"

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 02:44 PM

You do more by getting people to "wake up" to the media distortion we call the Blue Pill than by changing a vote.

Even if Trump wins he would face the Globalist Tyranny on his own.

John F. Kennedy tried this... he ended up with a dozen bullets flying at him.

<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=U1Qt6a-vaNM>

[deleted] • 4 points • 28 September, 2016 06:37 PM

This debate, I think, showed that Trump is part of it. He could have called out Clinton a lot, but actively chose to give up his frame. It's probably a better bet to vote for him though on the chance that he's going against it.

TheSilentPajority • 2 points • 29 September, 2016 03:18 AM

fuck, this is what I realized too. the moderation was against him, but he still did terribly. he missed so many opportunities to attack her corruption and instead he lost frame and focused on stupid anecdotes. I wanted him to do well, he had every reason to be able to, but I found myself disgusted with him.

RobertCarraway • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 04:54 AM

It felt like he was pulling punches

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 29 September, 2016 01:18 PM

He was giving "trickle truth".

Trump knows that he can erode the "Official Narrative" in subtle ways, but if he speaks too much Truth he will be called a conspiracy theorist.

So he holds a tricky balance of waking people up "a little".

--Chocobo • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 03:48 PM

I know...but we have something different today than we did in the past, internet and the information that comes with it. Nonetheless the shift of wealth has made this situation crazier than ever. And the need for "security". Give me liberty or give me death =/.

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 04:19 PM

The internet sort of "by accident" allowed people to start talking and actually begin to wake up.

The Globalist Tyranny plans to **cancel** the internet very soon. (they don't like what is happening)

In a short time all free thoughts will be declared "hate speech".

The saying:

Truth is Hate

...will apply.

JohnnyRaz • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 08:49 PM*

Why are people here still calling Zionist Jews / Jews "Globalists" or "Illuminati" lol.

Jews own the media, they own the federal reserve, world banks, they practically own the government and many politicians, they have openly said they want to spread poisonous

shit like multiculturalism and open borders (in white countries) in the name of globalism. Arent we all big boys here? I think we can be truthful here if nowhere else.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 01:15 PM

No, because the thing we actually face is Dark Luciferianism itself.

There are Jews who oppose Zionism (the dark side) and could be on our side in the Alt-Right.

There are guys on the Alt-Right who are White Nationalists that don't want people waking up to the Red Pill and would prefer simple slaves to act as soldiers in their hoped for race war.

The Globalist Tyranny is the group whose goal is absolute world power.

And these days it's out in the open.

No one can seriously say:

"What? There aren't people seeking world government... that's a conspiracy theory... stop thinking that and be a good little slave."

JohnnyRaz • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 07:16 PM

Thing is, not Jews are Zionists, but all Zionists ARE Jews.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 09:21 PM

So that still means you should use the term Zionist instead of Jew.

Better still, just use **Globalist Tyranny**.

With Globalist Tyranny no one can claim it isn't true because they pretty much announce their plans. They openly say that they want power concentrated into this tyranny and nations are to disappear in order to complete their global control system.

Those of the Globalist Tyranny can be Zionists, but not all of the Globalist Tyranny are Zionists.

Muslims are part of the Globalist Tyranny and they aren't Zionists... so are Catholics because of the Pope.

BassNet • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 06:16 AM

Clearly you've never heard of mutually assured destruction.

zedsdedforever • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 08:30 PM

Again. What is the solution? Using my critical thinking and ability to learn is not coming to a solution. My job requires me to connect the dots to prevent bad shit. I don't have the personality to be a bystander as you offer (we are not talking white knights either)

Using my critical thinking and ability to learn is not coming to a solution.

Why does one need an immediate solution?

Of what value is that?

There is a saying:

"Don't jump to conclusions."

...which applies.

Gather as much knowledge as possible. When a solution is necessary then you must go with the best information you have up to that point. But if new information comes in you need to reroute the old thinking and connect the dots differently.

Once you lose mental flexibility you become "dead to the world" and simply repeat your pre-existing understanding.

To continue to grow and adapt means to continue to absorb more and more.

There is no end to gaining knowledge. (and to reconnecting dots differently)

zedsdedforever • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 10:19 PM*

There comes a point in time that action needs to be taken and sitting back learning has run its course. My job deals with gathering knowledge to a point and then taking necessary action but my timeframe is very short when it comes to be effective in my specific job. I have learned adaptability, and flexibility over the years because I had too or I would die in a shithole 3rd world country. Your answers are akin to modern politics. All words, no substance. Do not recite the esoteric shit, give me substance. You have enough time on your hands with the amount of posts you do to offer a proposed solution. What you have given me is an infinite while loop with no false criteria.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 01:09 PM

Truth emerges from chaos to become literal.

Some people simply lack the ability to comprehend this higher level and for them I do suggest they follow some literal sort of knowledge which (hopefully) isn't too dumbed down and Blue Pill.

zedsdedforever • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 01:23 PM

You still don't answer the question. I have met people such as yourself that were able to bridge the gaps from chaos and see events not normally visible. Their gift was also their flaw; they usually suffered from aspergers or bipolar disorder. They also were unable to take said events and present them in actionable deliverables. Your "higher level" is to complicate, mine is to simplify. Bullshido vs short and sweet.

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 01:33 PM

No, I'm both high level intellectually as well as high functioning socially.

I'm what would be described as an "extreme extrovert" socially.

Plus, I'm the type that gets projects done on time and under budget.

But most people **aren't** this way and need a teacher to guide them... thus the reason for a 55 year old man spending time on the internet trying to help the damaged male children become better men.

p00pey • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 11:56 AM

I disagree with your disagreement. Reading garbage propoganda will not make you wiser. Especially for the young and impressionable. Yes there is value in learning from different opinions, but of those opinions are so off the wall, the only thing you're learning is that the authors of said opinions are idiots.

If I sit here and write a 100 page book about how the world is ending on Jan 1st because the sun is going to explode, and I provide no scientific backing, other than to just say that it will happen because Hillary will become president, you aren't going to learn much from it other than to learn that I'm an idiot...

NeoreactionSafe • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 01:59 PM

Ideally you would absorb *everything*.

What I find is I can read something and by now quickly know it's argument already. So in effect I already **have** (past tense) absorbed it.

But having a deep set of knowledge is easy at 55 years old like who I am.

If you are say 18 years old and barely able to figure up from down I completely understand the emotion of being overwhelmed by too much data.

But in the end... Knowledge is Best.

Ignorance has no benefit for you... Ignorance might be Bliss, but it's not helpful other than the feelz.

RobertCarraway • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 04:57 AM

Ignorance is fine for those who have no ability to act on knowledge.

Momo_dollar • 30 points • 27 September, 2016 03:04 AM

Perspective from someone who isn't from the USA, has little knowledge of what went on before. I knew more about Trump to begin with, all I knew about Hilary was that she was recently I'll.

Trump is good at arousing emotion in the weak and downtrodden. He keeps saying this is wrong that's wrong and it's because of them and them. He has good superficial points, but it's like he can't go deeper into anything and he doesn't offer any solutions.

Hilary started weak and seemed nervous for the first 2 mins. But after a while proved to be much more intelligent and able to go deeper into things and explain complex things with simplicity, also she is the more Machiavellian of the two.

[deleted] • 15 points • 27 September, 2016 06:18 AM*

I found that Hillary wasn't any deeper on lots of issues. She did a lot of circle talking but offered no real plans just a bunch of visit my website. She sounded like a twitch streamer trying to built her twitter and you tube follower numbers.

For example on the jobs issue:

Her job plan was we build jobs and generated huge numbers last year > Trumps rebuttal was those jobs are low quality and low pay. Her response was we will build more job in these areas. Then retreated to check my website for details and explained nothing.

At least trump had a plan in re-negotiating NAFTA, trashing the TPP and reducing corporate taxes/regulation in specific industries. If this is a good plan remains to be seen but it was addressed.

I would say both are very surface answer candidates neither gave any specifics on the what and barely on the how.

Momo_dollar • -2 points • 28 September, 2016 05:25 PM

To sell fruits first you have to plant seeds.

bmrdriver • 20 points • 27 September, 2016 06:13 AM

With Hillary they are just words she memorized, no action. She doesn't believe any of it, if she gets elected it's corruption as usual.

good_guy_submitter • -3 points • 27 September, 2016 06:46 AM

There are trusted rumors that she was wearing an ear piece during the debate.

p00pey • 13 points • 27 September, 2016 11:58 AM

let me guess, the same websites that tell you we're going to go to war with russia yeah?!?

Nergaal • -5 points • 27 September, 2016 09:29 AM

Even if that were true. It is done now. Move on or get stuck into oneitis

Snufek • 15 points • 27 September, 2016 02:00 AM

Democracy is one of the most idiotic systems ever created. With the majority of people being fucking morons... Just think that a guy who sits at home all day, is morbidly obese, stuck in a dead end job, hadn't had sex once in his life, his only hobby is video games and has no clue about what life is about - he decides for you. After all, there are more of *them* than *us*.

smokecheck1976 • 20 points • 27 September, 2016 04:20 AM

That's why the founding father's created a republic, or more accurately a republic of republics. It's also why they had controls on who could and could not vote. They wanted people that voted and held office to have some skin in the game and not just anyone that would vote themselves money out of the treasury, which will be our ruin.

good_guy_submitter • 5 points • 27 September, 2016 06:55 AM

The 16th amendment was the beginning of the end. Downhill from there on.

[deleted] • 14 points • 28 September, 2016 01:48 AM*

Democracy is one of the most idiotic systems ever created.

Jesus, the tween edginess in this subreddit these days. I know it's tempting to let your feels be the lens by which you understand politics, but put down the fucking stridex pads and pick up a history book.

Idiotic, compared to what - feudal serfdom? communism? stateless tribal anarchy? absolute monarchy? theocracy? sharia? Be specific. Which one of these really awful things do you find to be less idiotic? No cheating making your frame of reference some hypothetical thing that doesn't exist, it has to be something that actually exists in the real world.

Write us a field report after moving to a part of the world with no concept of democracy and living there. Personally I recommend North Korea and Somalia. Let us know how much less idiotic their system is.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 01:59 PM

I'm surprised parliamentary democracy is never talked about stateside. It's been the most effective so far, adopted everywhere but in Yanktown.

I'm also seeing the benefit in separating the firehead, from the head of state, much fewer demagogues running things.

Granted, slows down an already slow process of legislation, so there's that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 06:39 PM

I'm pretty sure he meant pure democracy...

[deleted] • 17 points • 27 September, 2016 12:38 PM

Democracy is one of the most idiotic systems ever created.

One of the red pills you need to swallow about the world is that political systems are never created on a clean slate. They're always a result of compromise between the various factions that make up a state.

Democracy was the inevitable result of industrialization. Before industrialization you had an agricultural economy. The rich could afford armies and the poor could rebel with inferior equipment and organization and had very little chance of doing actual harm to the rich unless the rebellion were truly massive. The French Revolution was one such massive rebellion (which still ended with no sort of democracy, by the way), but before it hundreds of jacqueries or peasant revolts had been attempted, none with any lasting success.

But once economies became industrialized then suddenly the mass acquired much more power. Striking by even a fraction of workers (such as coal miners or train operators) could seriously damage the interests of the rich, and the army having to be turned into a mass-conscripted force put that much more power in the hands of the conscript masses. It's no coincidence that popular revolutions (i.e. revolutions chiefly sustained by the working class) became much more successful once industrialization took hold.

European elites slowly and recalcitrantly came to realize that to contain that threat they had to give in to some demands. They had to give the working class a stake in the country's governance, so that instead of rebelling outright they'd get involved in the political process and channel their grievances through it. That's how modern democracy was born: a compromise between the elites and the industrial masses, whereby the elites kept governing (with few exceptions, all Western democratic governments were made up of upper class educated men) but the working class had a way to choose between which strand of elite governance their preferred.

Over the last few decades our industrial base has been exported to other countries and workers have lost the implicit threat-power of strike. And that's because you're now seeing democracy being effectively dismantled, with mainstream parties all converging around an ideology, globalism, that unabashedly pursues the interests

of the elites and fucks over the working class. They simply don't need to fear any longer.

heelface • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 06:01 PM

"Democracy is the worst form of government..... except for all the rest." -Winston Churchill

cheaperautoinsurance • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 01:27 AM

Indeed. Unfortunately, all other governments types tend to end up is despotic regimes. Be careful what you wish for.

max_peenor • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 10:20 PM

In virtually all functional democracies throughout history, there was no sitting home all day. No one fed you. No one gave you a job. There was little time for whimsy. Democracy is for hard men and women that listen, which itself is the most functional arraignment for the human race. The problem is when men get soft.

-contrarian- • -4 points • 27 September, 2016 02:51 AM

Yup. It's a terrible system. Artificial intelligence is our best bet. Governance by logic and not by emotion.

good_guy_submitter • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 07:00 AM

I have a feeling that would be worse than Nazi Germany. Execute the disabled, they are leeches who don't contribute.. Labor camps for the unintelligent persons. No rich people, all resources distributed according to duties. Execute the elderly and sterilize women 35+ due to pregnancy risks. No more food flavors, you'll now be eating Soylent green for every meal. Artwork and games illegal as a waste of time. Etc...

A world without emotion is awful.

Although I wonder what the results would be if you programmed the AI to maximize happiness for both men and women.

TrumpSEXYMAN • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 10:20 PM

you do know 'nazi' germany had one of the highest standards of living in the world and was the ahead of the rest of the world in technology?

this changed after 1943, of course. but germany was still ahead of it's time.

they were a nation-state for the people that promoted the betterment of the people.

good_guy_submitter • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 10:59 PM

Any idea off the top of your head of what caused them to go south? I haven't heard this side before, I always figured Germany was just so-so and then pumped all of their economy into the war.

TrumpSEXYMAN • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 11:04 PM

Germany wasn't in a full war economy until 1943. In fact, it wasn't until 1944 when they reached their highest output.

I say they had one of the highest standards of living until 1943 because that's when the allied bombing campaign began wrecking havoc.

By the end of the war they had the best technology - just didn't have the people or means to use it. Whether it be the V1/V2, first jet aircraft, etc.

Horus_Krishna_2 • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 03:12 PM

kind of like how the south lost to the north in civil war. numbers matter, who has the most troops wins. technology does too but well if Germany had nukes they didn't use them.

-contrarian- • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 11:52 AM

The problem with your argument is you have had the pleasure of living in a world where there are no consequences allowed, and thus are viewing the current system through rose-colored glasses.

Sooner or later we'll all get to experience the collective consequences of governance by emotions. Something tells me you'll end up preferring your proposed negatives of logic.

good_guy_submitter • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 01:27 PM

Emotions are great but they need to be kept in check by logic and reason. If you full emotion you go full retard

xx69bootyhunter69xx • -1 points • 27 September, 2016 05:17 PM

To be honest, I can't wait for machines to take over us. Seriously, they'll do a far better job of ruling us than our human 'democratic' leaders. In real life I choose the red pill, but in the Matrix, I would have chosen the blue pill, choosing to get ruled by cold calculating logical devices than emotional bags of flesh and bones.

[deleted] • 63 points • 26 September, 2016 05:16 PM

Donald Trump = Red Pill

Hillary Clinton = Blue Pill

That's all I have to say.

Whiteouter • 103 points • 26 September, 2016 07:04 PM

He may be "redpill", doesn't make him less of an idiot.

I am not saying that Clinton is any better, just that Trump is not the saviour people make him out to be.

animal_one • 25 points • 26 September, 2016 08:40 PM

No one is going to save us. No one can make America great again because the foundation of the country, the people, is rotten. That being said, I think Trump can give us some more time and perhaps avoid an all-out war with Russia.

GayLubeOil • 42 points • 26 September, 2016 10:42 PM

No one can save America from its quantitative easing dollar printing extravaganza.

the_calibre_cat • 12 points • 27 September, 2016 02:46 AM

No, but Trump's the first person to even talk about it like it's a serious deal. He could never get anything passed for the long-term benefit of the country, because Congresspeople rely on the "infinite money" spigot to win re-election, but he IS taking about it.

BananaKick • 11 points • 27 September, 2016 01:04 PM

He is not the first person. Ron Paul, Rand Paul, Gary Johnson, etc. have been talking about it for years. Unfortunately the American public think that they're nuts.

--Chocobo • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 04:21 PM

Bernie Sanders...Jill Stein...

nonthaki • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 07:26 PM

Jill Stein , best candidate .

<http://www.businessinsider.in/Green-Party-candidate-Jill-Stein-tried-to-crash-tonights-presidential-debate-and-was-escorted-out/articleshow/54534834.cms>

TheBiggestZander • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 07:31 PM

If it was affecting the interest rate, I would be opposed to it. But interest rates are at an all-time low, and the US economy is the strongest in the world. You wouldn't call the program a success?

LuckyLuke23 • 14 points • 27 September, 2016 01:49 AM

he's not. but when the OTHER person you have to choose from his Hillary " I Will lie cheat steal and turn your country into a feminist haven" Clinton.

he looks like a saint.

we all know polities are out for themselves and their friends... you vote for the lesser of 2 evils.

well you do where i come from (Aus). we have to vote by law.

the_calibre_cat • 9 points • 27 September, 2016 02:55 AM

he's not. but when the OTHER person you have to choose from his Hillary " I Will lie cheat steal and turn your country into a feminist haven" Clinton.

he looks like a saint.

Ba-ding. If you want to impede the pussification of America, Hillary is a mortal enemy.

Unfortunately, must people in America are pussies, so the "give me free stuff my life is so saaaaad" crowd will probably emerge victorious in November.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 26 September, 2016 07:44 PM

Yeah, to some extent he is better. Still lots of same old shit. Catering to the huge corporations rather than the people, but that is every politician these days. On the plus side he wouldn't be stripping us of more rights and working to make us dependent upon the government.

Hrc = war here in the states

DT = war overseas

Either way, we will be in a big fight with someone, because war is very profitable for the politicians and their owners.

TheEagleAndTheSnake • 8 points • 26 September, 2016 08:01 PM

Why do you think DT = war overseas? Interested (cuz I'm overseas)

vengefully_yours • 16 points • 26 September, 2016 09:07 PM

Both Bush's sent me to war, the second one after 8 years of a Democrat turning the other cheek. It's profitable for them to attack another country, and they'll use any justification they can. Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11, but it justified going in there.

Republicans are all about profit. Especially when they don't pay for it in any way. Dems are all about bigger government and more control of our personal lives.

[deleted] • 6 points • 26 September, 2016 10:59 PM

[permanently deleted]

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 06:48 PM

We can hope man. I've done two wars for both Bush presidents. I'm sick and tired of it, and nobody gives a fuck about what it has done to us. All we get is empty platitudes and hollow thanks. It's never been more obvious to me than now, that men are expendable. I want him to be who he says he will. We'll see.

[deleted] • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 06:41 PM

The Bushes were globalist neocons. Trump is not.

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 06:55 PM

I'll wait and see. If he really isn't one of them, there is no way they'd let him be elected. Call me cynical of you like. I'm down for a reset. Back it up to about 1912, or maybe back to Teddy's time.

I don't dislike him, but he has a long way to go for me to trust him.

rubenbrasil • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 12:07 AM

You're getting caught up in party lines.. the truth that was revealed is that Democrat and Republican were two different flavors of the same thing. Their core principle on both sides is NWO neocon shit. AKA Establishment = Neocon

Trump isn't establishment, hence the major resistance from the media. Trump doesn't want war overseas, probably with the exception of taking out ISIS. But he won't create wars to profit like Bush in Iraq or Hillary in Libya. ISIS is inevitable.. we have no choice but to fight them. They're bringing the fight to us, no matter what. It's like work, we hate it but it's something that needs to be done.

vengefully_yours • 3 points • 28 September, 2016 06:52 PM

I'm outside the party lines and see then for exactly who they are. Trump appears to be outside, but it's he?

Our elections are a dog and pony show, the equivalent of bread and circus in ancient Rome. Making people think or feel like they're a part of the system, when really they're not. We have no say, no voice, and they even showed us without a doubt that is true. Bernie wins the most votes, hrc gets the delegates. They're not even trying to hide the fact we don't matter, other than production slaves.

This misdirection keeps us divided, and makes most easy to manipulate. Aka useful idiots. So, is Trump the same old shit with a thin veneer? Gotta wait and see. I don't dislike him, but I never trust politicians, even if it's their first time,

Hillary make no effort to hide it, because she doesn't need to. She has voters based solely on party lines, her vagina, and she isn't Trump.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 07:58 PM

That would actually be very interesting.

Obama epitomizes that sentiment on the left. He was supposed to be the chosen one, the ultimate show of the left. Trump looks to be the same version on the right, not a neocon, he's just the american dream, personified.

I wonder how americans will react if he ends up being a status quo figure. Is it going to be learned helplessness, or will americans be the sleeping giant, woke?

RobertCarraway • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 05:05 AM

Is it going to be learned helplessness, or will americans be the sleeping giant, woke?

Americans will be the sleeping midget, woke. If this country had the same demographics/beliefs that it did 80 years ago it would be a different story.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 03:47 PM

It's obvious where she would take us, and the most amusing part of that is it's not because she's a girl. It's because of her disdain for law, the people in the country, and her at all cost, self serving, her first and only fuck everyone else mentality. She is a shit excuse for a human being, and would make an atrocious leader.

Trump, well all we really know of him is the TV shows and the act he puts on. I saw Ozzy in concert earlier this month, and the man is nothing like his character on TV. It's a fucking act. At least with Reagan we had an idea because he was the governor of California first. I'm not a huge fan, but I'd rather give him a chance than take the inevitable fuckery she will bring.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 06:47 PM

She's not even hiding it. I'm with her.

The entire brand is based on you getting under her, and lifting her on your shoulders to greatness. At least MAGA assumes him providing value to the voter

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 06:45 PM

Careful. His rhetoric on Iran and his steadfast Israel-first stance refute this. However, that's all it may be to win voters: rhetoric. After all, he's the only candidate to extend an olive branch to Russia after years of NATO provocation. Putin played a similar game and cozied up to a lot of cronies before coming into power and imprisoning many of them.

In other words, we should vote for him, but don't be surprised if he's not as anti-establishment as you think.

p00pey • 2 points • 26 September, 2016 09:17 PM

Politicians on both side are about profit. To tie that into the RP narrative, it's EVO psych in its simplest form. Greed, survival of the fittest, power, etc. once people get in power, they change. It's in our DNA. So these people, once they reach that pinnacle of power, work more on accumulating more power/money than serve the populous. Hence democracies are crumbling, including th greatest in the world. Human nature is human nature, laws of men

cannot ever overpower natural laws/urges. Same applies for sexual strategy, same for politics, same for race, religion, all of it.

Enjoy the decline...

Invalidity • 4 points • 26 September, 2016 09:50 PM

The primary difference between Republicans and Democrats is which corporations they are supporting.

The problem with people is that they are voting for candidates on primarily every other aspect of politics other than economics. Pro-life versus pro-choice, more taxes/less taxes, gay rights, etc. None of that shit matters; if the majority of people wanted to do themselves a favor, they would be voting for candidates that look out for THEIR financial interests.

p00pey • 4 points • 26 September, 2016 10:02 PM

they all support any corporation that allows the to stay in power or allows them to accumulate more power. There have been recent articles detailing the relationship between the clintons and goldman sachs. That org is as republican leaning as possible, yet they own the clintons because they pumped enough money their way.

Also google who writes most of the bills that come up in front of our legislature to become law. i'll clue you in, it's lobbyists that represent corporations. LITERALLY. Meaning corporations pump enough money into politicians to basically own them. Then, they push for legislation that is beneficial to them. SO what do the politicians do?!? They don't even care anymore what that legislation is. They ask those corporations to get their lobbyists to write up the bill, and they'll support it on the floor. There are many instances of politicians caught with zero knowledge of bills they sponsored. When they were challenged via debate by those that opposed the bill, those politicians basically stood there like deer staring into headlights.

The democracy is a joke. The only reason it exists is because the people are too dumb. Too caught up with what kim kardashian is doing tonight to worry about the state of the union. Sad day in america...

Invalidity • 3 points • 26 September, 2016 10:18 PM

It's a double-edged sword: the majority of the populace is too ignorant and unintelligent to make informed decisions, yet if they were all significantly more intelligent, the world would be a much more dangerous place.

Humans are only more intelligent creatures than the primitive animals in the wild, yet we are still animals at our core. We want resources and we want to reproduce. The people at the top are all rich because they've found a way to siphon resources from the poor.

To make a significant change in this world, to assist the poor in realizing that they are being duped, is difficult because as you said, they are being inundated with unimportant and trivial media.

StoicCrane • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 07:07 AM

Dumbed down on a scale before never seen. Machines invented and sponsored by the few are enthralling the many. Tech is developing faster than the average human can account for to our collective detriment.

When or "if", at this point, future generations live to look back on this period it'll be ominously known as The Technological Dark Ages.

the_calibre_cat • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 02:53 AM

The problem with people is that they are voting for candidates on primarily every other aspect of politics other than economics. Pro-life versus pro-choice, more taxes/less taxes, gay rights, etc. None of that shit matters; if the majority of people wanted to do themselves a favor, they would be voting for candidates that look out for THEIR financial interests.

That shit DOES matter, though. You may not think it does, but somewhere out there is a voter to whom it matters. If anything, voter's economic interests are more often centered around the social rather than the economic.

Economics moves libertarians, and that's about it. Every other political group "cares about economics" insofar as they can get some other poor bastard to pay for a chunk of their lives.

Invalidity • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 03:11 AM

It matters to someone but it is completely insignificant in comparison to economic impacts. And I believe you intended to say "voter's interests" and not "economic interests" since you mentioned social. My point isn't about what does or does not matter to people; the emphasis is on what is the most significant thing (which is what I was saying when I used the word 'matters').

the_calibre_cat • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 03:20 AM

It matters to someone but it is completely insignificant in comparison to economic impacts.

You're preaching to the choir, but the choir is not the majority.

And I believe you intended to say "voter's interests" and not "economic interests" since you mentioned social. My point isn't about what does or does not matter to people; the emphasis is on what is the most significant thing (which is what I was saying when I used the word 'matters').

And what I'm saying is that, since the dawn of time, what has held people's political sway has almost always decided political fortunes more surely than has the most logical economic path forward. It matters, and... That sucks.

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 07:01 PM

Been saying it for years, not much I can do about it. The government is owned, and not by us. It's not acting in our best interest, but for increased profit. The left goes after certain rights and makes incursions into our private life in specific areas, the right does the same in different areas, each telling the truth that the other is destroying our country.

People are easily led, Goering said it very well in Nuremberg.

TheEagleAndTheSnake • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 06:42 AM

Republicans are all about profit. Especially when they don't pay for it in any way. Dems are all about bigger government and more control of our personal lives.

This is a great way to explain both parties. However I think Trump is more of an outsider to both of them, isn't he? Republican nominated him only because he destroyed every other candidate there was...

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 06:43 PM

He is the only one who isn't some kind of Jesus freak, that had a lot to do with it, in addition to not being a career politician. He had the same aura as Reagan, but I wonder if he can pull it off like Reagan did.

zaiguy • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 01:36 PM

Trump has been saying that he would stop messing in other countries' affairs. Even uber-cucked NYT called Trump the "dove" in this election.

vengefully_yours • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 06:37 PM

Show one thing, be another. I read people, he will take no shit and go all in like Bush did. Dubya was an unassuming frat boy, look what he turned out to be.

I don't dislike Trump, but I know where we are headed.

RojoEscarlata • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 07:49 PM

Trump is not the same kind of Republican, he destroyed Jeb, and partially the Bushes', I hope he destroys the Clinton as well.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 30 September, 2016 01:50 PM

I'm in the wait and see camp. It's not easy to impress me.

StoicCrane • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 07:02 AM

You attest to the notion that 9/11 was an inside job?

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 06:42 PM

Hardly. A bunch of goat fuckers with box cutters exploited a weakness in our system. The government simply took advantage of it, not unlike Pearl Harbor, but since it wasn't another country doing it, only a bunch of religitards, there was no country to attack. So they picked a couple light ones and went for it.

To think our government could pull off something as audacious as that shows how ignorant of the government most people are. Ineptitude abounds in government, because they are not the smartest, only the most popular. I worked for them, and I've never met anyone more clueless about how everything works than politicians.

[deleted] • 12 points • 26 September, 2016 08:41 PM

That guy is just falling for the media narrative. He has shown that he can get along with a number of the world leaders and they will respect him.

Hillary is a different story. Her foreign policy decisions have been responsible for wars we have gotten in over the past decade. She is also a big reason why ISIS basically formed and why there

is so much chaos in Europe and the Middle East.

p00pey • 9 points • 26 September, 2016 09:06 PM

Actually GW is the ONLY reason ISIS exists. Don't regurgitate the same old bullshit, educate yourself. The Middle East is the mess it is now mainly because of colonialism, but the recent fuel to the fire has been the unnecessary war in Iraq that made Cheney rich...

Knowledge is power, regurgitation is vomit...

the_calibre_cat • 4 points • 27 September, 2016 02:48 AM

Agreed, but Hillary isn't a reversal of that neoconservative interventionism - she's a continuation of it. See: Libya. Sorry, but that was a colossal fuckup, and it shows just how desperate the media is to defeat Trump that it's not a bigger deal.

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 September, 2016 09:15 PM

Well you do realize that George W. Bush wasn't the only one responsible for this. The entire government was and Hillary happened to be one of the people who voted for the war, that caused this.

p00pey • 6 points • 26 September, 2016 09:41 PM

zero argument there, she's a hawk, much like anyone that reaches her level of power is. Because war is money. However, as a single senator, if you don't realize her power in starting that war vs. that of the president's office, well then you have an agenda, and I'll leave you to that agenda. As long as you understand your narrative doesn't align with the truth. The truth is the truth, the way men twist that truth to build that narrative has no affect on the truth. The truth doesn't care about anything but itself...

NPIF • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 03:58 PM

Hillary, as a Senator, voted for the Iraq war based on the premise that Iraq had WMDs. It was a false premise, and she was not the only Senator to fall victim to this ruse on behalf of the GWB Administration.

It should also be noted, and oft-repeated, that Trump publicly supported the Iraq war at its outset. He's flip-flopped on the issue and is lying through his teeth at every turn. It boggles the mind that so many people think Trump is more rational, reasonable, and a better candidate for the job of leader of the Free World than a woman who spent her entire career in politics.

max_peenor • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 10:16 PM

Colonialism? By whom? The Turks? No one has invaded and settled in the Middle East for 500 years.

I don't think that word means what you think it means?

... be careful. There is a trap in this post.

RojoEscarlata • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 07:46 PM

Trump doesn't cater to corporation, at least not in the way imply. His tax cuts are for everyone not just some. And the industry tax cuts are meant to encourage creation of jobs and more important

preventing industry to move abroad in order to avoid taxes.

I've seen it first hand, American corporations opening here in Mexico because work force and tax are cheaper.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 30 September, 2016 01:22 PM

Two of the jobs I used to work were moved to Mexico. Both technical CNC machinist jobs. Since I can write the program, I'm too expensive.

Corporate tax cuts have happened in some states, like Wisconsin. They pay zero corporate tax to the state. Who makes up the shortfall to repair roads, pay firefighters, police, and teachers? The people who live and work there. Wisconsin has roads in dire need of repair that are scheduled to get worked on in (I am not making this up) 300 years from now. Governor Walker did that. Guess what corporations did with the zero tax. They didn't invest it, didn't expand and create jobs, they gave it to the CEO and the other heads in the corporation. Meanwhile firefighters have a tiny budget, the police rely on the federal drug interdiction money, and teachers have no retirement with an included pay cut.

That is the typical Republican method. Give a break to the wealthy to increase profit without an increase in productivity, and make the average Joe pay for it. A tax break for everyone means less public services... Unless of course we tell the Federal Reserve to fuck off and we stop paying them interest on our own money. That won't happen. That is where 100% of personal income tax goes, to the Fed. Bet ya didn't know that about this country. Most of the people living here don't know that the Federal Reserve isn't part of the government or even part of the country, yet we owe them a few trillion dollars in interest because we let them sell us our currency.

So until we plug that hole, and we plug the holes that allow corporations to move production off shore and bring products in without tariffs, nothing good will happen for the people who live here. They'll remain indentured servants to the Federal Reserve, barely make enough to survive, and continue to struggle to achieve the dream of retirement that increasingly will never come.

That is what Trump is up against.

RojoEscarlata • 1 point • 30 September, 2016 09:43 PM

So until we plug that hole, and we plug the holes that allow corporations to move production off shore and bring products in without tariffs, nothing good will happen for the people who live here. They'll remain indentured servants to the Federal Reserve, barely make enough to survive, and continue to struggle to achieve the dream of retirement that increasingly will never come.

That's exactly what Trump proposed dude, he is not a typical GOP candidate, his proposal of cutting taxes and re-forming American trade deals (like the disastrous NAFTA)

Please, check his proposals in his page, you will definitely like it.

PS: I know your federal reserve in the way it works it's completely fucked up, but Trump proposed also to audit them, which is pretty awesome.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 30 September, 2016 11:11 PM

Audit, shit. The whole system is fucked up and nothing more than a way to control is and our economy. Need it gone.

I've read his ideas, and I've seen others say similar things and never even come close to

getting there. Also, read my lips, no new taxes. My idealism is long gone, but it would be great to have him actually fix shit.

RojoEscarlata • 1 point • 1 October, 2016 01:05 AM

I'm with you, nihilism and cinism have made me doubt too, but I do believe Trump's intentions.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 1 October, 2016 02:37 PM

Intentions sure, what he will do when he is there, have to wait and see.

rubenbrasil • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 12:03 AM

Hes as close to a savior as it gets.

All of us here on redpill are aware of how political correctness has destroyed Western society.. i.e. feminism, blue pill, sexism, etc

Hes the only one that has gotten enough momentum to actually break through the rigged process of becoming a nominee.. Even past decent presidents still had their hands in some globalist NWO bullshit.

We finally have one, and whether you may like him or not hes the first one to break through the 1000 barriers they throw at genuine non-estbalishment candidates.

His message is pro-western.. fuck islam and the PC the democrats are brainwashing our kids with.. they want us to be slaves for the bluepill corporations of the future. We finally have a warrior who is putting it on the line man, im not sure what your caught up on to not see that- and think hes a baffoon.

[deleted] • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 06:48 PM

He may also be controlled opposition. If he were completely anti-NWO, he wouldn't be such an Israel-firster and warmongering toward Iran. Also, Muslims aren't all bad. In European ghettos and Saudi, yeah, their ideology is pretty bad, but most living in the U.S. aren't that extremist. The media has just been hosting one false-flag event after another to tarnish them.

the_calibre_cat • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 02:45 AM

He certainly isn't, but he also isn't the out and out idiot-and-only-idiot that people make him out to be, in my view, and I was definitely in the "he's a complete idiot" camp at the beginning.

satanicpriest13 • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 08:25 AM

He's gonna make me money because people were too stupid to accept his presidency. That's all that matters.

anihilistlol • 11 points • 29 September, 2016 02:29 AM*

That was red pill? Trump spent half the time trying to break out of Hillary's frame, and he never succeeded. It was like watching a mother scold her child.

TRPrinny • 7 points • 29 September, 2016 04:24 AM

Yep, Trump is so reactive and childlike in his emotional control. There is very little in his behavior that is Red Pill.

I suppose a lot of people here circlejerking about him will keep hamstering that Trump is anything more than a played out joke.

vandaalen • 3 points • 26 September, 2016 09:09 PM

If you still believe that voting will change anything to the better for you, I have bad news for you regarding red and blue pills...

StoicCrane • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 07:10 AM

At this point it may be best to renounce US citizenship and expatriate to a foreign country before all the civilian guns get confiscated. Martial Law is looming over the next presidency.

p00pey • -1 points • 26 September, 2016 09:44 PM*

Our votes mean nothing anymore. I haven't voted in 20 years. Aging myself, I know. The system is broke. It's rigged. It's about those in power staying in power, accumulating maximum wealth. The drumpf is feeding off that, claiming himself to be an outsider. It's a joke. The system is the system, no one can buck it, we need a revolution to change things. If anyone thinks Donald would come in and institute massive changes, you are an idiot. Remember Obama ran on 'change' WTF has changed?!? For the better anyway? The real power brokers will assassinate anyone they feel would implement real changes that would affect their power/wealth. The system is rigged, and both sides are more concerned with keeping you distracted than anything else...

_the_shape_ • 6 points • 27 September, 2016 12:31 AM

we need a revolution to change things.

Change what though? Or more to the point, change *who*?

Hypergamy will still rage on unfettered (no putting that paste back in the tube). Same for social media and all the addiction that comes with it. People will still prioritize (and demand) all their hedonistic, distracting little pleasures. People will still swim in a revolting pool of laziness, fear and apathy.

People themselves would have to fundamentally change. They'd have to start giving a fuck about things, taking responsibility, setting aside their self-destructive habits and devoting themselves to truth, freedom, bettering themselves and, consequently, bettering the world. They'd have to set aside their prejudices for once, stand above hatred and contempt for one another and (finally) set their cross-hairs **as a unified whole** against the powers that be.

If that sounds too far-fetched for you, well, it's because barring some outrageous miracle, it is.

p00pey • 5 points • 27 September, 2016 11:42 AM

you know what, you are absolutely right. We've had thousands of revolutions through the history of man, but we end up at the same place. Because of human nature. Laws of the land can't overrule human nature, it just doesn't work. SO essentially we have to evolve for anything to really change. Otherwise, regardless of political system, economical system, whatever, the same shit will repeat itself. The rich/powerful will control the masses through whatever means possible, and the 99% will chug along obliviously. That's why it is of utmost importance to break from the matrix and carve out a space for yourself that is defined by you. If you're rugged enough, you can make a good life for yourself in most conditions, and especially if you live in america...

wade2634 • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 06:56 PM

Widespread culture of Islam curbs hypergamy, and so does India's culture of abstinence.

These come with their own problems of course. Only when we allow the sexual market to be a

free market do we get a need for TRP to the extent that we do. Women just make poor choices when it comes to sex, so we learn to take advantage of it.

Wilreadit • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 11:37 AM

Hillary is the most Red Pill person on the world. Only thing is she is not out to save America. She wants the power for herself.

TheEagleAndTheSnake • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 06:52 AM

Leaving this comment under yours. How big d you think the chance that the elections will be rigged is? Trump would win 99% if the votes were counted correctly, but if some of them just disappear? Like the Austrian presidential elections, the leftist candidate won by 'postal votes' no one has under control...

BassNet • 4 points • 28 September, 2016 06:15 AM

I doubt Trump is going to win after this debate, he made himself look like an idiot.

TheEagleAndTheSnake • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 07:57 AM

He didn't win but neither did Hillary who was smiling like a psychopath on four grams of LSD instead of answering questions. I personally think this is his strategy, lose the first one, get back on track in the second one and complete fucking destroy her in the third one.

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 September, 2016 12:27 PM

I mean to be honest, that's the thing that scares me. I do think there is a very good chance that this election might be rigged. The media has been all out against Trump and everyone knows it. Heck this video shows it: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nRp1CK_X_Yw

If it is rigged, you will see riots and chaos throughout the United States.

TheEagleAndTheSnake • 6 points • 27 September, 2016 01:08 PM

What in the glorious Martian fuck is that video full of SJW buzzwords? And yeah hahaha Ruffalo will reward all Clinton voters with his dick. Every single person in that video is a fucking sellout... I don't believe all of them are braindead enough to vote for Clinton. This just shows how being a celebrity = being a public puppet for those truly powerful. Cringe

MasterRiku • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 02:16 PM

Hillary has all the friends in higher tiers of government, no way in hell she isn't rigging this. The electoral college is supposed to vote according to the popular vote but they can be bribed just like anyone else. Either that or Hillary will make them have an "accident" if they don't comply

animal_one • -2 points • 26 September, 2016 08:37 PM

I'd say they're both 'red pill', they just appeal to different demographics.

[deleted] • 5 points • 26 September, 2016 08:39 PM

Interesting. I guess I meant it in the sense that many or most Trump supporters think with a red pill mindset. On the other hand, you notice how a lot of Hillary Clinton supporters adopt a more "blue pill" mindset. Given how Hillary is all about this feminist bullshit.

If you are beta, you are more likely to vote for Clinton. If you are red pill, more likely to vote for Trump.

StoicCrane • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 07:11 AM

In other words you're saying Trump is going to lose? 160k+ as opposed to millions hardly seems like a fair fight.

wade2634 • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 06:57 PM

You forget about all the Chads.

animal_one • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 03:06 PM

I know what you meant and agree 100%. I was just being autistic.

Momo_dollar • -1 points • 27 September, 2016 03:25 AM

You do realise Red Pill is about sexual strategy?

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 03:31 AM

Yes, but there are many posts on here that aren't just about women. Some are about finance, fitness, how to dress well, navigate the corporate world, etc.

I think it's about unplugging and looking at how society isn't completely what we were taught as kids growing up.

p00pey • -8 points • 26 September, 2016 09:00 PM

He's redpill in a way that all billionaires are redpill, which is to say they always get their way. However, he is still one of the foremost idiots/assholes I. The world. And a deep look at his business acumen shows he has basically bullied and lied and cheated his way to where he is, at the cost of common people.

I know a decent size of TRP is racist, nationalist, and alt right or whatever bullshit label you want to put on it. Just know this, if you truly subscribe to rp theory, you shouldn't subscribe to al that hate. RP teaches us to be th best we can be in a fucked up world, not to get ahead hating on others or making excuses about how I migrants are holding us back or whatever other bullshit excuse. Life is too short, don't waste it on hatred...

On that note, Hillary is also a loser, but at least not delusionally unhinged like the Drumpf...

the_calibre_cat • 9 points • 27 September, 2016 02:58 AM

He's redpill in a way that all billionaires are redpill, which is to say they always get their way. However, he is still one of the foremost idiots/assholes I. The world. And a deep look at his business acumen shows he has basically bullied and lied and cheated his way to where he is, at the cost of common people.

I know a decent size of TRP is racist, nationalist, and alt right or whatever bullshit label you want to put on it. Just know this, if you truly subscribe to rp theory, you shouldn't subscribe to al that hate. RP teaches us to be th best we can be in a fucked up world, not to get ahead hating on others or making excuses about how I migrants are holding us back or whatever other bullshit excuse. Life is too short, don't waste it on hatred...

While I don't disagree...

...You are kidding yourself if you think Hillary's crowd doesn't hate the fuck out of you for taking a single word of this subreddit seriously - and she'll have the power to do a great deal.

Trump faces resistance from the opposing party, the vast majority of the media, and even *his own* party.

A vote for Trump is a vote for a federal government in check. A vote for Hillary is a vote for an

unchecked hard left turn - and men ultimately suffer from that. We'll probably be okay, but our progeny won't be.

ScalingAedes • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 11:42 AM

Are you joking?

Trump is an insecure, thin-skinned man-child who just had his frame demolished in front of the nation.

GayLubeOil • 22 points • 26 September, 2016 05:44 PM

Hillary Clinton delights in the death and suffering of people

MattyAnon • 53 points • 26 September, 2016 06:07 PM

Especially male people.

Women have always been the primary victims of war. Women lose their husbands, their fathers, their sons in combat. - Hillary Clinton, Conference on domestic violence in San Salvador, El Salvador (17 November 1998)

[deleted] • 13 points • 26 September, 2016 06:50 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

nonthaki • 11 points • 26 September, 2016 07:09 PM

Oh yeah , Men lose their actual fucking lives i.e - they die in the battlefield ; while women dont lose their lives (literally and figuratively) cause they can still marry another guy and have an okay life .

vengefully_yours • 22 points • 26 September, 2016 07:45 PM

Shit, they don't even need the man to be killed, they'll jump to another cock while he is deployed.

nonthaki • 6 points • 26 September, 2016 07:47 PM

Haha :) True . Fucking True .

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 05:27 AM

And if he died in combat, guess who normally gets that sweet \$400k from SGLI?

vengefully_yours • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 06:45 PM

Yep. First thing I did was cut my first wife out of it, and set up a trust that my parents controlled, so they could provide for my kids. The ex would've blown it all on frivolous bullshit.

satanicpriest13 • 5 points • 27 September, 2016 08:34 AM

And white males. She's quick to call every white racist and blame the entire country for the race divide. These guys are the epitome of blue pill, disregarding straight white males. I'm not even white but I can see she is demonizing them.

p00pey • -2 points • 26 September, 2016 09:53 PM

you're referencing Russian propaganda to make a point?

Really?!?

WOW

GayLubeOil • 6 points • 26 September, 2016 10:36 PM

Russian propaganda is in English because it's intended audience is the west. This is not Russian propaganda. This is the sincere opinion of Vladamir Zurinovski leader of Russia's second largest party LDPR and intended for domestic Russian consumption.

disposable_pants • 4 points • 27 September, 2016 04:48 AM

You're pretending that the Russian government doesn't also target propaganda towards their domestic population -- they do.

GayLubeOil • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 05:05 AM

Why would the Russian Government waste their time convincing their citizenry to be pro Trump? Which is why this isn't propaganda just an opinion.

disposable_pants • 7 points • 27 September, 2016 04:51 PM

Why would the Russian Government waste their time convincing their citizenry to be pro Trump?

I can think of at least four reasons:

1. They think it can sway the U.S. election (and they think a Trump presidency will be favorable to Russia). Foreign citizens can donate to U.S. presidential candidates, and it's possible to use foreign approval ratings as arguments for/against a particular candidate (look at how Democrats use the fact that many foreign heads of state don't take Trump seriously as a pro-Clinton argument).
2. They are building domestic support for Trump in the event they want to work with him in the future. If they think there's a chance of a Trump win, and he's currently unpopular in Russia, it's prudent to boost his popularity so there would be greater approval of potentially partnering on some sort of future international agreement.
3. Russian leadership likes Trump for some reason and their propaganda merely reflects that. Maybe he has a personal or business relationship with Putin, maybe Putin/Russian leadership hates the Clintons for some real or perceived slight at some point.
4. They want to discourage the idea that a highly unpredictable person could wind up in charge of the world's largest military and economy. Uncertainty is bad for the economy, and Trump brings uncertainty. If they can't influence the election they can at least influence the perception of him as unpredictable.

And it's not really a "waste" of time or money -- they have a state media outlet with nothing better to do. In any event, it's safer to assume that Russian media has a state-supported agenda than it is to assume it's reporting facts in a sober, neutral way.

Original_Dankster • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 02:03 PM

Quite simple actually - Trump's stance on NATO and non-interventionism abroad. Russia wants less US troops in Europe and a somewhat stable middle east even if it means leaving dictators in power. Trump wants European countries to protect themselves (i.e.

fewer US troops), and opposes "regime change" abroad.

good_guy_submitter • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 06:49 AM

Because CtR shills were paid to spread rumors about Russia being connected to Trump online. Russia isn't spreading propaganda in Russian for anyone to read and vote for Trump... That would just be idiotic.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 01:39 AM

This is not Russian propaganda

He refers to Osama bin Laden as a "foreign person" and "the leader of some organization" as if Osama bin Laden was just some random guy. The absurdity of characterizing him in this way is a good indicator of how seriously a well-informed person could take this video.

p00pey • 2 points • 26 September, 2016 11:05 PM

oooooh. Ok. That makes total sense now. Thanks for setting the record straight. I now accept everything that guy says as the truth. Thanks agan GLO...

Nergaal • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 09:34 AM

Blue pill, red pill, or purple pill. You don't need to choose either to cheer loudly or on the inside when Osama died. You have to be cucked serously into Russian propaganda to defend Osama.

GayLubeOil • 5 points • 27 September, 2016 09:37 AM

There is a distinction on defending international legal norms like state sovereignty and defending U.S government trained terrorists like Osama Bin Laden. Unfortunately that distinction is lost upon the proles.

Nergaal • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 09:43 AM

Not really the point. US went in, took him out, suffered some negligible diplomatic backlash, done. The TRP analogy would be to hook up with a married woman who didn't actually want to cheat, but you were such a Chad you ignored that and got what you want.

GayLubeOil • 4 points • 27 September, 2016 09:52 AM

A better analogy is a rich guy breaking into a poor guy's home shitting in his bed and flying away on a helicopter. Then the poor guy complains but no one gives a fuck because they are all paid off by the rich guy.

Nergaal • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 10:51 AM

Neah, that is hamstering. What is the Sexual Strategy analogy?

Invoker11 • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 12:41 PM

yo check ur private msg.. thanks for the help m8 :3

p00pey • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 11:45 AM

You are really showing your stupidity strongly here GLO. If the poor guy came to my fucking house and destroyed things, including human life, best bet I'll go shit in his house, and

probably kill his kids on the way out too...

But your analogy is garbage anyway, not even sure why I engaged...

GayLubeOil • 6 points • 27 September, 2016 11:52 AM

It's the rich guy who shat in your house and you can't do anything about it because he payed everyone off. My analogy is amazing you just have garbage reading comprehension.

nonthaki • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 08:55 PM

GLO typed his comment correctly . You misread it . Read it again .

[deleted] • 5 points • 28 September, 2016 04:08 PM

Centipede here so not exactly unbiased but going into it I said Trump would be subdued, and he was.

I agreed with Scott Adams on it, millions of undecided voters watched the debates, they've heard non stop that Trump is the evil demonic person and literally hitler.

And they got the Trump you saw at the debate, which is nowhere near what the media has portrayed him as.

Trump had 20k plus in Florida post debate while hillary had fuck all at her post debate rally.

TheSilentPajority • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 03:28 AM

I'm a centipede too, and I thought he looked crazy. he looked like he was on amphetamines or coke or something. subdued only seems to be a euphemism for lost. he could have been calm and dominant. but he was just hyper and ill-spoken while simultaneously missing a ton of easy jabs at her curruption. the blind hype on the donald right now looks delusional to me. he got mired down in stupid issues like birtherism and his taxes. he just looked petty the way he handled it.

CDBaller • 14 points • 26 September, 2016 07:58 PM

A Clinton presidency spells disaster for the western world and men everywhere. I'd suggest that any men in government service on here, have your escape planned and ready to execute if she's elected.

logicalthinker1 • 13 points • 27 September, 2016 03:10 AM

The more feminized the world becomes, the most advantageous it is to be red pill.

You can't run from thousands of years of evolution. You can't just "make" women be attracted to weak, placating, "I'll do all the chores honey while you spend my money" men. They'll never get the tingles for that no matter how much you brain wash them. In reality, it will take thousands of years of more evolution to lose that instinct. In the mean time, I'll be hitting the gym and the pussy. I thank all the future beta faggots for making it so much easier to slay your women.

[deleted] • 13 points • 27 September, 2016 12:16 PM

The more feminized the world becomes, the most advantageous it is to be red pill.

Up to a point. Society can get increasingly feminized and you can reap the rewards of being one of the increasingly few manly men... until your society collapses because its strength has been sapped in this process, because it no longer stands up for its interests or even knows what they are.

CDBaller • 8 points • 27 September, 2016 04:37 AM

Of course, that's what TRP is about. I just see Hillary doing for gender relations what Obama has done for race relations.

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 September, 2016 06:21 AM

So we are looking forward to gangs of men and women killing each other and blaming the cops? Great....

good_guy_submitter • 4 points • 27 September, 2016 06:53 AM

When a woman cop kills a woman, it's because of sexism!

kagetsuki23 • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 01:04 PM

clinton will destroy the economy.

logicalthinker1 • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 01:38 PM

It takes more than one person to destroy a multi-trillion dollar economy. The fact is that or economy has been heading in there wing direction for a while. We are becoming socialized more and more.

The issue is that because our economy is so fucking huge and strong in general, it can withstand short term ideas that are shit. You can spend buttlloads on useless, unsustainable programs for years and it won't show the true damage of those programs. It takes decades to take down such an impressive economy.

[deleted] • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 01:40 AM

if she's elected.

I never doubted that she was going to win. Regardless of how people vote.

king_of_red_alphas • 15 points • 27 September, 2016 08:26 AM

I say this as somebody who values TRP very much for it's stated purpose. (sexual strategy)

Honestly it's not going to be any surprise that 99% of TRP'ers who are basically Trump's core demographic be Clinton's sworn enemy.

Angry white males support trump? You don't say...

PERSONALLY - I reserve my TRP principals for SEXUAL strategy and PERSONAL development, not some social movement to wage jihad against the feminist bogeymen.

In terms of who I want at the helm of government, I truly feel Clinton will basically hold status quo while Trump could essentially set the world on fire. The man is simply a fucking clown in the level of Sarah Palin. Maybe worse.

He would, at the very least, be nominating 1 or 2 SC Judges, which alone is reason for me to oppose him.

TBH, I'm kind of blue pill in my politics as I believe in the government providing free public education, Medicare, taking care of the mentally ill, etc. most TRP philosophy is closer to a social Darwinism which I just can't get behind from a government pov.

Finally, anybody that watched the debates should realize this man is anything but an example of "holding frame".

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 27 September, 2016 01:11 PM

I reserve my TRP principals for SEXUAL strategy and PERSONAL development, not some social movement to wage jihad against the feminist bogeymen.

It would be obvious to you by our neutral stance on here that we're clearly not using this as a social movement, but it would be *extremely* naive to believe that the evolutionary psychology we discuss here doesn't permeate every other part of your life. Everything we build as a species is an abstraction on top of the original and core elements of survival as a species: Survival of the fittest, and sexual selection.

funnydownvote • 3 points • 27 September, 2016 09:56 PM

TRP only works for you/in our lives because the world is blue pill.

If the world were to be survival of the fittest RP style, then TRP would no longer work for any one of us.

[deleted] • 4 points • 28 September, 2016 09:41 PM

No, it would still work for some. But yes, generally, it would not work as well for as many.

Swagzor9000 • 10 points • 26 September, 2016 06:48 PM

However, that doesn't mean the presidential race doesn't affect a number of our US members

This election and this debate will affect every person around the globe. Especially for the countries in Europe. I will wake up at 3am to watch this peece of history and which way the world will be heading to the following years. Bluepills suppressed by the islamic state or Redpill and the return of man?

I'm dead serious about this. The Donald is the definition of Alpha and the alpha the world needs right now.

vengefully_yours • 5 points • 26 September, 2016 07:47 PM

He still has to deal with the legislative and judiciary branches, he can't act unilaterally. However, she will mean civil war here on the states, especially if she does what she says she will do.

p00pey • 2 points • 26 September, 2016 09:54 PM

do tell what she's going to do that will cause a 'civil war' here in the states?!? This is news to me, and also one of the dumber things I've ever read on the interwebs...

vengefully_yours • 4 points • 27 September, 2016 06:57 PM

It's rather complicated, but suffice it to say that there are a few hundred thousand war veterans in the US now. A large number of us will still uphold our oath to defend the Constitution. We understand how the real world works, not the white bread very low risk world that we have secured within the US. An attempt to remove our rights and our ability to personally defend them will result in a war. You probably don't see it, but the only vets I know who aren't thinking similarly had office jobs and never did anything dangerous.

I know, sounds ludicrous to the civilian mind, all conspiracy theory and illuminati bullshit. Travel the world, meet interesting and exciting people from ancient cultures, and realize they are quite like us, especially that they are being manipulated to kill for someone else just like we are, and you see the world different.

Call it stupid if you like. There are those of us who sacrificed more than you'll ever know to protect our rights, we won't easily surrender them. We know something you apparently don't.

kagetsuki23 • 2 points • 28 September, 2016 01:26 PM

she will incrase the tax on workers money to give it to people that don't work. she will overtax

corporations making them go bankrupt, what will prevent peoples to find jobs.

the whites will be more blamed about their privilège by other race and bullied because of it, and they will not accept to be robbed without a fight.

guns will be taken away an illegal market for guns will be born. criminality, terrorismes will increase.
she is big bad news.

Serrano- • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 08:44 PM

She wants to make us the UK, with her the Prime Minister and Queen. That means disarming the plebeians. Unfortunately for her we are not the UK.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 10:14 PM

Its fine even if he gets elected and his hands are tied.

People who say Clinton will maintain the status quo are completely deluded.

More than anything Trump has single handedly changed the overton window and trashed the mainstream media liberal narrative.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 03:38 PM

I agree, but I will wait and see what he does. Until then he is an unknown. We can't assume he will be beneficial, but we know that she will be very detrimental. It's it enough that he simply isn't her, or vice versa? I think not, but we are not involved in the political process, even if we think we are.

Jcart105 • 2 points • 29 September, 2016 05:51 PM

I'm surprised no one in this thread wants to mention how incredibly biased Lester Holt was as a debate moderator.

2comment • 9 points • 27 September, 2016 12:38 AM

Trump should just let Hillary keep yapping tonight. My god, that grating patronizing fucking screeching harpie voice for 4 years on straight. You'd think Huma would slip some lozenges up her vag to smooth it out some, but no.

I'd vote against her on that alone even if I was die hard commie.

Hokuto199x • 3 points • 28 September, 2016 10:44 PM

Donald doesn't even understand the questions. The security aspect of cyber is tough? We have to do better at cyber? Are you for real right now?

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 08:32 AM

Pussypassintotheovaloffice

Lsegundo • 0 points • 26 September, 2016 10:47 PM

I expect Trump to absolutely destroy her in the debates by dumping the pile of shit that is her public life on her head.

He will not play nice. He isn't going to be polite. I wonder if it matters or not?

The people who are more likely to get offended than to consider his points are locked in for Clinton anyway.

[deleted] • -1 points • 26 September, 2016 07:19 PM

Well, let's see. We've got certain war with Russia vs. maintaining a balance of power, more statism and global government vs. capitalism and individualism, terrorism vs. safety, war for profit vs. reaching out to our traditional 'enemies', more actual racism and marginalization vs. liberty and freedom. Toughy.

SatanAscending • 4 points • 26 September, 2016 08:32 PM

Non-American here. Why do you think it will mean war with Russia? Wouldn't it get closer to Cold War at best?

smokecheck1976 • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 04:24 AM

Because it's what the elite cabal that are running things want. It's why Hillary and Obama manipulated a civil war in Syria. Keep us spending billion after billion in conflicts that we have nothing to do with and nothing to benefit from. Then set us up against a country with an economy about the size of Mexico's so the world can be more easily polarized and controlled again. Maybe not a hot war, but a return to the bad old days of the proxy wars that we called the cold war.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 07:41 AM*

statism and global government vs. capitalism and individualism

There's a good argument to be made for either candidate being either side of this. I'm leaning towards Hillary being better on capitalism and individualism than Trump, although the Republicans ~~on the whole are better on it than~~ are usually tied with Democrats in that matter.

[deleted] • 1 points • 26 September, 2016 10:09 PM

[permanently deleted]

kagetsuki23 • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 12:29 PM

yep democrat = more tax. i don't even know how anyone that make cash can support them.

-Anteros- • -1 points • 27 September, 2016 01:10 AM

Hillary's first answer is feelgood pabulum, shocking no one.

SKIANI • 1 point • 27 September, 2016 05:09 PM

He played defense all night. I don't think she thought he would be defensive all night. She attacked him on every weak point he has and he took the attacks. Now if she does that for 2 more debates, it will be a disaster and people will notice, what else can she do now? His goal I think was to survive and advance. Take the blows quietly and continue forward. He did not win it tonight nor did he lose it. CHESS MATCH

cheaperautoinsurance • 3 points • 28 September, 2016 01:59 AM

he fucked up. call a spade a spade. this wasn't some kind of uber strategy. he was rambling and back pedaling on the defensive the whole night. fucking awful and I love the guy. he better get his shit together for round 2. i can't believe he didn't prep, wtf.

kagetsuki23 • 1 point • 29 September, 2016 05:37 AM

he did not, he showed his ability to control himself. there is still other debate and it there that he will show his murdering moves.

sqerl • 1 point • 28 September, 2016 12:23 PM

Found this on GLO twitter feed. Debate was rigged. Fuck this election.

<https://youtu.be/3XSUG5aCFGs>

StumpinToVictory • -3 points • 27 September, 2016 04:00 AM

I believe Trump actually decided to go soft on Hillary on purpose and appear imperfect. In the end, it's all about how you finish and Trump will likely get stronger with every debate as a part of his plan. I think as the election goes on, Trump will slowly start to bring up Clinton's ties to Byrd (KKK leader) and start to act more refined. IMO, Trump did decent in the first debate but Clinton had some highlight reels. CNN will promote Clinton as the winner but I will look at other polls too. Overall, I feel like Trump barely lost it but it doesn't really affect him all that much.

ambrazura • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 12:53 PM

Donald Trump - there are some emotions, he's clueless about many things in this world.

Hillary Clinton - somewhat experienced politician which kinda understands external policies, that is paradoxical for a woman.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 September, 2016 01:16 AM

We need to keep those jobs here

JohnnyRaz • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 08:39 PM

This was basically how the debate went

Also, every poll online says Trump won, except the heavily biased mainstream media. (Over 95% of all media owned by same people)

[deleted] • -6 points • 26 September, 2016 09:58 PM

[permanently deleted]

p00pey • 2 points • 26 September, 2016 10:20 PM

The game is the game. Players come and players go, the systems is too big to implement any serious change. Because the system has been built to ensure the true power brokers stay in power and extract maximum profits from staying in power.

The only way anything 'changes' is if we have a revolution. The system as it stands will chug along, changing players every few years while keeping everything status quo. If people haven't realized from the 8 years of obama, where practically nothing changed while it was billed to be the presidency of change, than you are a sheep that can't truly see the truth...

naMlliPdeR • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 02:02 AM

Almost all polls other than CNN have Trump winning the debate.

ShallITinder • 0 points • 28 September, 2016 10:34 PM

Trump won but any online poll saying that is a fraud, yet CNN polls that oversample Democrats are somehow more accurate.

Faymozilla • -17 points • 26 September, 2016 06:52 PM

Hillary Clinton cheated to win the democratic nomination. Donald trump conned his way into the republican nomination.

redartist • 23 points • 26 September, 2016 07:03 PM

Trump may be a lot of things, but we pretty much know for certain that he's not going to attack men if he's elected.

With Hillary it's the other way around. Obama was the "race" president. Race relations in America today are way worse than in '08.

Hillary will be the "gender" president. Expect male sexual intent to be criminalized.

You will need to produce written consent forms, video, audio evidence - something concrete not to get prosecuted for "rape" should a woman retroactively retract consent.

TRP is a sub primarily about sexual strategy. One candidate is clearly superior than the other in that regard.

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 September, 2016 01:32 AM*

This. I cannot stand the thought of listening to even more feminist rhetoric. After having to read articles in the media every day which serve the feminine imperative it would be sickening to hear even more of it. Feminists have already won the war in the west yet they do not give a shit about women in the third world. Trump may also do some decent back room deals with China and Russia. Those dudes can hopefully schedule a secret meeting, drink some scotch, get blown by some A grade hos and sort out the Islamic problem once and for all.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 September, 2016 07:20 PM

Bernie would have to be on the field to be a cheat-win

Last I checked, he wasn't even allowed on the field.

JohnnyDildonics • 0 points • 26 September, 2016 08:22 PM

Agreed, but his con was still more honest than her and DWS' cheating. Although, after Bernie lost his stage to BLM, that was it for him. He just became a canvas on which others projected their own personal rage.