

Dicipres

ARCHIVE

www.TheRedArchive.com

ABOUT THIS ARCHIVE

An archive of the blog **Dicipres**, as held by TheRedArchive: 96 posts published between March 2011 and March 2014.

About Dicipres. Dicipres, titled "A Guide for a Young Patriarch", is a blog active from 2011 to 2014 analyzing intersexual dynamics, feminism, and family from an analytical, evolutionary-psychology-inspired perspective. It argues for patriarchy as a social technology and covers hypergamy, concealed ovulation, marriage economics, and cultural decline.

About TheRedArchive. TheRedArchive is a free, public archive of the Red Pill community, built so that none of this writing can quietly disappear. It holds **1,686,402 posts** and **38,839,914 comments** from 45 subreddits and 56 blogs. Much of it survives nowhere else — the accounts deleted, the subreddits banned, the websites long offline. All of it is free to read, search and download, and always will be, at www.TheRedArchive.com.

Support the mission. This Red Pill archive is free — no paywall, no account — but keeping it online isn't. I pay for the servers, the storage and the bandwidth myself, so that this valuable knowledge stays online. If you want to support the mission and archive, become one of the people who help keep it online at www.TheRedArchive.com/#help.

Share this file freely, and keep a copy of your own. What sits on one server can be taken down; what sits on a thousand hard drives cannot.

Best regards,

/u/dream-hunter

Founder of TheRedArchive

July 28, 2026

Introduction

dicipres · 28 March 2011 · Archived copy · Original

Dear young patriarch,

This is an honest guide I am writing to you in order to give you as much knowledge and power possible regarding the current state of affairs in the world you grow up in. Much of the information I will give is hard to hear, but it is necessary for you to have the most accurate model of our society and the challenges you face as a future young man.

I will do my best to guide you and give the best information I can. However, note that the advice I give is based on my experiences and observations. I am a flawed man and have my biases and errors. Your failures and successes belong to you alone to be ashamed and proud of. There are no guarantees that you will succeed, but I have trust in you.

Virtue of Self-Discipline

dicipres · 6 January 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Discipline, in general, is not positive or negative. It has a practical usefulness to enforce hierarchical power structures and thus to allow groups of people to organize and operate efficiently.

Self-discipline, however, is inherently different from just discipline (i.e. to follow orders given by authority). Self-discipline is the most inner and essential means of power you have. It is the source of your resolution and represents a struggle to be free from the most inner jail. A jail build from emotions and feelings imposed by our bodies, our genes, to control our behavior.

A patriarch power should come first from himself, his ability to focus and achieve his objectives, his ability to be a role model for his family and his authority as a leader. If you lack authority over yourself, you will not be a worthy leader with authority over others.

Obtaining self discipline, like all virtues, requires developing the habit of self-discipline and awareness of your goals and values, which are your sources of motivation.

On Physical Fitness

dicipres · 6 January 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Following a physical training regime and maintaining a healthy body is of importance to any human being. However, for a patriarch there are additional requirements of sexual virility and the capability to inflict violence (crucial ability even if this ability is never applied). Both of these abilities are inherently connected to your physical fitness. Furthermore, weight lifting training increases your testosterone levels, which will naturally lead into developing the patriarchal virtues and a healthy masculinity.

For these reasons, any patriarch should keep a disciplined regime of physical training which include both aerobic exercises and weight lifting.

On Values, Rules and Frame

dicipres · 7 January 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Our values determine who we are. These values are no more than inner rules we apply to our behavior, our lives and our relationships. These rules are powerful, since if you don't have a clear set of values you will be affected to manipulation of others and collapse your view of the world to the frame and values of others.

A patriarch set the rules, he decide the values he lives by and requires the people he is in contact with to comply.

These values are a source of strength and will naturally attract women due to the submissive nature of their sexuality.

An example of the power of an inner rule come from GAME. There are many sexual game theories about how to behave in various situations in order not to have lower status (see [Roissy](#)) and thus attract women. However, nearly all these methods all fall under the following value/inner rule:

- **I do not accept disrespect from others.**

Truly following this rule is equivalent to 1000 pages of advice on how to behave in every conceivable situation.

Your inner rules are a large part of who you are. Be aware of your values. Write them. Memorize them. Your values are the only thing that cannot be taken away from you and, as long you follow your values and not the values of others, is the inner core of a patriarch.

For Women Any Sex is a Commitment

dicipres · 11 January 2012 · Archived copy · Original

When a woman have sex with a man she might use the pill and might use a condom. Still, there is a part of her mind, an deep unconscious part of her mind, that will view the intercourse as it was thousands of years ago, as a commitment of a woman to a man.

A commitment to take the man sperm inside of her body, a commitment to be pregnant with the man's child for nine months, a commitment to have painful and dangerous childbirth, a commitment to feed the child and a commitment to take care of the child.

For a woman any intercourse is a commitment, no matter what her conscious lips say, no matter what feminism and sex-in-the-city indoctrinated her to think about sex.

Always remember this.

A woman who have a one-night stands, a woman who sleep with men after several hours, a woman who can casually willing to commit to any man, who can casually give so much of her body, time and energy, for free or for the very small price of alcohol, has very little to offer.

Such a woman is not worthy of having an emotional bond with. Her commitment to you will be shallow since she had already gave her commitment to the all the men she had sex with before.

Developing Your Virtues

dicipres · 15 January 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Aristotle said: “We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, then, is not an act, but a habit.”

Most of our behavior is dictated by habits. Growth and personal development is generally not simple or easy. It requires persistence and self-discipline.

However, by changing your behavior you will eventually change your habits and then your behavior will naturally be more in accordance with the virtues you wish to develop.

A Crude Model for the Bond between a Man and a Woman

dicipres · 2 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

The relationship between a man and a woman can be reduced to two basic bonds as providers and as lovers (we, obviously, neglect some accuracy in order to obtain simplicity and a better insight).

Being a good provider is being an ally, a financial support, an emotional support, to help in raising children, to clean and cook for your family, etc. Both men and women can be viewed as providers, even in traditional bonds, although what they are expected to provide may vary by gender. The definition of a good provider is mainly cultural; however, in general, **a good provider (male or female) is a good teammate in the family team.**

Being a good lover is being fit in the Darwinian sense, i.e. having good genes. The attraction to “lover” traits is mainly genetic and innate. Men are mainly attracted to women who have sexy bodies and are able to go through the hardship of labor (which is similar in many cultures). Women are mainly attracted to social status, which definition is more plastic and changes from culture to culture (see [Billion Wicked Thoughts](#) and [HookingUpSmart](#)). In general, **a good male lover has higher status than the female and a good female lover is sexually attractive.**

In order to attract a woman for a short and uncommitted sexual bond only high lover ability is required. For long term bonds which include both sexual and committed partnership, both provider and lover virtues are required. The attributes of a lover and a provider are often conflicting and many men thus fail the lover test by trying to be good providers (i.e. nice guys).

A compromise of the two lover/provider qualities is made in every long term committed bond. Some examples of men lover/provider abilities:

1. Having a good prestigious job – Good provider since you can support children and good lover since you have high status.
2. Cheating on your wife – Bad provider since you endanger the family team and a good lover since you are desirable by other women.
3. Attempting and failing to cheat – Bad provider since you endanger the family team and a bad lover since you are not desirable by other women.
4. Woman attempt and fail to make you cheat – Good provider since you hold a social contract and a good lover since you are desirable by other women.
5. Your wife nags you and make you cook/clean – Good provider since you support and sacrifice for the team and a bad lover since you have lower status.
6. You decide to cook/clean – Good provider since you support and sacrifice for the team and a neutral impact on lover ability.
7. You tell your wife to cook/clean and watch TV- Bad provider since you don't help the family team and a good lover since you have high status.
8. You tell your wife to clean while you cook dinner – Good provider since you help the family team and a good lover since you have high status.

Today, as is evident in declining rates of marriage and the increasing hookup culture, the bond between men and women is getting weaker and weaker and relationships are shorter and less committed. In addition, young women are more financially and socially powerful (young women are more educated than men, making more money than men, better protected by law, etc.) and thus have less need for a provider. **Hence, in general, men today should focus more and more on achieving lover qualities, which are more desired by current women and are appropriate to short and less committed bonds common today.**

(A note about misogyny: Being a misogynist means that you don't value women and, in your perspective, they have low status, and thus you see yourself as having higher value, which is an attractive “lover” quality. It is thus not surprising that many players are misogynists, since it helps their game (roosh even explicitly said “[just be sexist](#)”). Hence, although a man treating women respectfully is a good provider trait, ironically, in the current SMP men

‘should’ be sexist in order to enhance their lover qualities and would be sexually rewarded for their misogyny. You can see this phenomena occurring in college fraternities.)

Placebo Effect of Game

dicipres · 6 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Game and its various forms, smart or stupid, for one-night stands or for marriage, has huge effects over the lives of many men, including me. However, I must admit that a large part of the effect of learning game comes from placebo. Thinking you know the intricate dynamics of sexual relationships help you in managing the intricate dynamics of sexual relationship.

The Pregnancy Status Gap

dicipres · 6 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Since it is the woman, not the man, who will become pregnant the added burden will affect the dynamics of sexual interaction. For this reason women hookup for one night stands with men with more status then they have. This status difference is the pregnancy status gap.

The Knowledge that Divorce is Common has Huge Effect on Marriages

dicipres · 7 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Marriage, in its essence, is a partnership between a man and a woman in order to enable physically, financially and emotionally safe environment to children to develop in. It allows the men to transfer his resources from competing over women to raising his children.

Fifty years ago, divorce was very rare and thus a man, or a woman, could make huge sacrifices for their families. However, since divorce today is so common, both parties must take caution and protect their individual interests more, and thus the family interests less. Therefore, the popularity of divorce affect intact families.

Genetic Equality

dicipres · 8 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Men and women have the same genes, but different manifestation of the genetic data due to sex hormones. If one gender is better at doing activity X, the other gender can use the exact genes to achieve the exact same ability.

Therefore, all differences between men and women are trade offs related to different reproductive strategies. If one gender has a reduced ability to do activity Y, it is only due to the need to better due activity Z and better serve it reproductive strategy. Hence, men and women are different, but these differences are quid pro pro, there is some equality in evolution.

Disclaimer: I hate feminism and the religiousness of feminist drones, this is not the feminist “we are all identical” equality idea.

The Evolving Western Matriarchy

dicipres · 8 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

This post is not written as opposition to the growing power and dominance of women, relative to men, in the western world. I am more and more beginning to believe that 'gender-patriotism' feminist or MRA is illogical, since men and women are inseparable groups. Some 'gender-patriots' only understand this when they have a child of the other gender, for some even this does not help. I do support the MRM, for now, since... well... I just hate the hypocrisy of modern feminism and its religious-like followers.

The goal of this post is to describe this huge shift in power between the genders which will have significant effects on the lives and relationships of men living in such western feminist countries.

There are differences between men and women, differences emanating from different sexual organs and thus different sexual agendas. Maybe women are more fit in the current market? Maybe the current state and trends are due to feminism? Probably, this is a combination of the two. Whatever the reason may be, our sons will grow up and will go into a world which we never knew. A world which feminists didn't even dream of in the 70s. A world in which our boys will grow up to be, on average:

1. Less educated than women
2. Earn less than women (this is currently the case for young men and women)
3. More vulnerable in divorce and family courts
4. There is an unclear and ever increasing definition of what sexual harassment is and laws which see two drunken people having sex as rape
5. Men are to be less healthy than women and die younger, yet get less health budgets
6. There are less and less marriages and the bonds between men and women tend to be shorter, easily dismantled, based on less emotions and more sex.
7. Most children are born out of wedlock (this number is currently 42% and is expected to keep growing).
8. Boys are raised more and more without the presence of a father, and the men figures are replaceable while the woman is not. **Most boys will not have a male family lineage, girls will.**

Point 8 is crucial. Due to this reason I believe we are currently seeing the creation of a matriarchal society, since such societies (such as the Masuo matriarchal society) are characterized by the elimination of the father from the family. This gives the women the power within the household and boys are raised without masculine guidance and under the authority of a woman. This is already the case today in the vast majority of single parent homes. Furthermore, social help by the state is effectively transferring wealth from traditional families and men (on average) to these woman-led households. Women today can get the support of men, due to taxes and child support, without giving men any say within the house or on the way that the money is spent. This arrangement does seem to be sustainable.

This data is basically unprecedented in the western world. We are in a new world, with different rules and different power structure. The feminists may as well have a victory parade and celebrate in the streets (they won't because they need women to feel like victims, not powerful matriarchs, in order to gain public support).

You can love it or you can hate it, it doesn't matter. Reality has changed, this is not a man's world anymore and our sons will grow into a basically matriarchal society.

I guess some boys do not care if they are more and more powerless, there is porn (for now at least) and video games. But that is not what I want to teach my son.

Our sons will need to adapt. This does not mean for them to accept having low status, low power and judicial

intimidation. The world has changed, but they can control their close environment. My suggestions for my son include things like I. disengage as much as possible from the current culture II. Keep your body healthy. III. Keep your mind sharp. Learn inner game. IV. Know that there is an innate part in every woman that wants a strong dominant man. V. Try to create patriarchy in your life, by the leader in your relationships and your work. VI. Bow to no-one. Be careful but don't live in fear from going to prison. VII. You probably can't change the entire world, but you can definitively control the part of the world that is close to you.

We need to reach to young men today and guide them in a way that no politically current school curriculum can.

References

<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/07/the-end-of-men/8135/>
<http://blog.ted.com/2011/08/05/talk-and-survey-are-we-seeing-the-demise-of-guys-philip-zimbardo-on-ted-com/>
[http://articles.cnn.com/2009-04-08/living/out.of.wedlock.births_1_out-of-wedlock-unwed-mothers-wedding-dress?
_s=PM:LIVING](http://articles.cnn.com/2009-04-08/living/out.of.wedlock.births_1_out-of-wedlock-unwed-mothers-wedding-dress?_s=PM:LIVING)
<http://www.economist.com/node/15174489>
<http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2011/06/15/a-tale-of-two-fathers/>
[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/18/us/for-women-under-30-most-births-occur-outside-marriage.html?_r=1&page
wanted=all](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/18/us/for-women-under-30-most-births-occur-outside-marriage.html?_r=1&page_wanted=all)
<http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,2015274,00.html>
<http://newsone.com/nation/newsonestaff2/report-72-percent-of-african-american-babies-born-to-unwed-mothers/>
<http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/acrossstates/Rankings.aspx?ind=107>

Equal, not Identical

dicipres · 14 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Good idea: To eliminate laws that give people different treatment based on their sex, race or religion.

Bad idea: To expect that all groups would succeed equally if there is no discrimination.

Even worse idea: To look only on cases in which a specific group is doing better and eliminating all of the group dominance while ignoring all the cases in which the said group is doing much worse.

Much worse idea: To make laws that give people different treatment based on their sex, race or religion in order to achieve social equality.

This is the current Orwellian **“discrimination is equality”** feminist politically correct agenda, common in the west.

‘All people are equal’ is a definition of equality of the value of a human life. We decide that we see all lives as equal. It is an arbitrary, emotional decision. There is no actual way to measure ‘worth’ of a human being associated with the most basic definition of human equality.

Different groups have different abilities, culture and motivation. A world in which men get half the custody and women are half the CEOs will very probably be a very unfair world.

Hypothesis: the Feminist Bitches would Complain in Every Conceivable Situation

dicipres · 17 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

If, traditionally, men would cook and being in the kitchen was considered masculine and if women would traditionally work outside the house, I hypothesize feminists would just probably complain about the following (or similar):

1. Men control food distribution and women are forced to work and provide for the men.
2. Women working for providing for men is “slavery.”
3. Cooking classes for young girls will be demanded as empowering women.
4. Allot of other BS.

Just read this crap by feminist leaders:

Betty Friedan claimed that suburban domestic life are a “comfortable concentration camp” for women, and to their husbands a SS prison guards.

Marilyn French called men “the enemy.”

Germaine Greer wrote that that: “women have no idea how much men hate them.”

Rosalind Miles described men as “the death sex.”

Valerie Solanas wrote “The SCUM Manifesto”, the Society for Cutting Up Men, and Robin Morgan obligingly publicized this hate literature.

References

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/rethinking-men/201010/why-some-people-have-issues-men-misandry>

and also look at this on the never ending requirements for pleasing feminist scum

<http://www.the-spearhead.com/2012/02/17/hugo-schwyzer-under-the-bus-or-a-warning-to-all-male-allies-of-mainstream-feminism/>

“Quite frankly, its offensive”

dicipres · 20 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Ever heard the, “quite frankly, its offensive”, argument from a politically correct nut job?

The validity of an argument or an opinion is determined by how accurately this opinion or argument correlates with reality, not to its not being offensive or not hurting someone feelings.

By declaring themselves offended the political correctness police can control the opinions and vocabulary used in discussion. Don't let them have this power over you. Tell them to keep being offended. Truth is more important than feelings.

Men's Reproductive Strategies and the Effects of the Feminist State and Current SMP on these Strategies

dicipres · 23 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

We are a product of evolution and, thanks to Darwin, we now are aware of the evolutionary process. Evolution is aware of itself.

Due to evolution, we exist in such a way that certain events, such as observing the beauty of a woman, an attack on our social status or a personal achievement makes us attracted, angry or happy. These feelings, which are chemical responses emanating from our genes, motivate us to certain behaviors which are beneficial to our survival and replication of our genes.

Our genes use feelings in order to control us. Thus, it is expected that as human beings, we are susceptible to distort our view of reality in order not to hurt our feelings and to make us feel that our lives are important and purposeful. However, taking the most straight forward approach and looking only on the evidence we have at hand, **there is no higher goal or purpose to our lives, we simply exist**. If we detach ourselves from our gene-induced emotions, the decision to reproduce is an arbitrary decision. An axiom, on which we can later use logic to analyze and improve our behavior.

Within the context of the guide to a young patriarch, this axiom can be defined by **The First Patriarchal Value: A genetic lineage is of the utmost importance to a patriarch.**

The world changed much faster than our genes, and thus the “instructions” our genes give us can be destructive and even “insane” in the biological sense (e.g. paying to have safe sex with prostitutes is biologically insane, since the urge to have sex is due to the “genes” desire to reproduce, while in reality this behavior is not beneficial to reproduction).

While no human being can (or should) be detached from his gene-induced feelings and behave completely logically, we can still consider logical analysis to assess and thus affect our behavior.

We can thus analyze the reproductive rational of various sexual behaviors of men while including the massive changes that occurred to our environment. (Again, I note, in reality no man will make these decisions without emotions, however, logical analysis can be used to have some effect on your decision.)

A committed father and husband

Bad list:

1. Danger of being cuckolded, cheating is common and socially accepted.
2. Divorce is common and can leave you broke and thus reduce your chances to have reproduce.
3. Divorce laws are in benefit of the mother. In case of divorce your bond with your children can be used to control you and limit your freedom. You will lose both your resources (alimony/support) and power (the mother will decide how to spend your money and how to raise your children).
4. You are highly invested in a single woman, and thus lose other options.

Good list:

1. Your children will have a better environment to grow up if you are committed to them.
2. You can use modern paternity tests to protect yourself from cockloding by players/Cads.
3. By giving your commitment you will get a more attractive woman than based on your attractiveness alone.
4. If you choose carefully and wisely (and have some luck), strong bond with a ‘good girl’ can cause huge joy and add allot to your life.

Player/CAD/absent father

Bad list:

1. Your children will have a worse environment to grow up.

2. Modern paternity tests and laws to can be used to make you pay child support.
3. You have to have high status and be attractive, or else you will basically be celibate.
4. Your emotional bonds with women are shallow.

Good list:

1. No danger of being cuckolded, they will have to prove your paternity to make you pay.
2. You can cohort with a married wife and cuckold a “committed father” and use him to provide your children with a better environment to grow up. (BTW, such behavior is justified by several feminists and manginas)
3. If you are high status and have money, you can impregnate many women without fear of bankruptcy due to child support.
4. You can have a variety of women and thus not limited to a specific woman.
5. You escape from things like alimony or losing your resources.
6. You are not emotionally attached and thus have more freedom and less risk of emotional pain.

Total MGTOW/celibacy/Xbox and porn

Bad list:

1. No chance of children. You are not playing the game, so you cannot “win.”

Good list:

1. You are not playing the game, so you cannot “lose.”
2. You keep your resources if you will later on want children.

There is allot more to be said about the dangers and benefits of each of these (or combination of) approaches, and such discussion will be written and introduced into the guide later on. However, it is evident that there is a clear conflict between the “A committed father and husband” and “Player/CAD/absent father.” Furthermore, with the exception of the paternity test, most changes in society seem to benefit the “Player/CAD/absent father,” as long as he has enough status to impregnate allot of women. It is also interesting that several countries take action to **make paternity tests illegal**, eliminating one of the only new benefits in the “A committed father and husband” arsenal. With regard to “Total MGTOW/celibacy/Xbox and porn”: I understand and have some sympathy to all the men who does not want to participate in the current SMP and family courts, however, this approach (if taken to extreme) is basically genetic suicide, running away from confrontation, and is the opposite of patriarchal values.

Outside of the Politically Correct Box

dicipres · 29 February 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Maybe the best thing of being part of the MRA/game men's movement is the fact that supporting such a cause forces you to let go completely of political correctness, the desire to not offend others, and to adhering to mainstream ideologies. Outside the politically correct box you are free to think the most terrible thoughts.

However, being liberated from thought control can also be somewhat intimidating for the same exact reasons. When you are outside the limiting box of political correctness you see allot of sickness and hate, much of it very similar and sometime worse than the hate inside the political correctness box. Since the masks are off in the manosphere, nazis, other racists and true women-haters can say what is really on their minds (disclosure, I'm ethnically Jewish, not that it really matters to me or have any relevance to most of the MRA/game).

As I repeat throughout my blog, Truth is more important than feelings. It is better to be outside the box, where everything is open, every statement can be made, and deal with the other "bad" (or not) people here. It is better to be free to think the even most horrible thoughts than to go back to the mental prison of politically correct insanity.

Tell Everybody

dicipres · 4 March 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Tell everybody about the manosphere.
Tell everybody about game and MRAs.
Tell everybody about reddit.com/r/mensrights
Tell everybody about Roissy and <http://heartiste.wordpress.com>
Tell everybody about Paul and avoiceforemen.com
Tell everybody about Ferdinandad and inmala(or bona)fide.com
Tell everybody about roosh
Tell everybody about Glenn Sacks
Tell everybody about dalrock
Tell everybody about girlwriteswhat
Tell everybody about athol kay
Tell everybody about Price and the-spearhead.com
Tell everybody about Rollo and the rationalmale.wordpress.com
Tell everybody about fathers-4-justice.org
Tell everybody about the ones not mentioned here

Lets make this knowledge available to everybody. Post it on the walls in your universities. Post it in every comment section or forum where young men may be. Tell it to young men of your family and people you care about so that they will fuck (in either weak or long and strong bonds) as they please and will not get fucked by the state.

Lets help to free the young men of tomorrow from the politically correct thought prison and help make them informed and ready for the challenges and dangers expecting them in the feminist states.

So, You Still Want to be a Family Man

dicipres · 10 March 2012 · Archived copy · Original

This is probably the worst time in history to be a family man. Families also mean allot less than they used to and much of the benefits, like sex, companionship and children, can be obtained without marriage. Divorce is common, with rates of about 50%, and even the reported rate of marital satisfaction (for the 50% which did not divorced) has dropped compared with the past [1].

As I mention repeatedly in the blog, the bonds between men and women are getting weaker and weaker.

Feminism hurt women chances to form a strong bond with a dominant man, which is a necessary part for sustaining sexual attraction within women. Individualism allowed both men and women to abandon their vows and cheat or leave without regret and being judged, thus hurting the trust between men and women. The sexual revolution and socially encouraged sexual promiscuity reduced the emotional value of sex, which was used in the past as a basic block for creating a strong bond between a man and a woman [1,2,8].

There are groups in our society in which the state induced socially weakening of men, rampant sexual promiscuity [2] and lack of faithfulness lead marriage to all but disappear [3]. Replaced by family court imposed financial arrangements and fatherless children. There are groups in our society with feral boys who do not know what a real functioning father is. **Groups in which the family man does not exist anymore.**

On the other hand, there are also groups in our society that still have strong marriages, with low divorce rates, and strong bonds between men and women. For those who live in these groups marriage may be worth the risks. With all the possible emotional pain and financial loss, there are still allot of women which are worth it and can add allot of value and happiness to your life.

Today, if you want to follow this route you need to improve this deal as much as possible by having a strong inner game, by understanding women's sexuality (and especially the darker sides of it), by having honest expectations from women and by choosing your woman very carefully.

Looking at correlations between divorce rates and marriage quality and various other parameters suggest the following guidelines to increase the probability of a happy and stable marriage

1. Choose a woman with low number of sexual partners [2,8] (BTW, evidence also show that you also should preferably have a low count).
2. Be educated and marry an educated woman [4] (However, be as, or more, educated and intelligent. Your wife should look up to you.)
3. Earn more than she does ("For every \$5000 extra a woman earns over her partner, their risk of divorce goes up by 5%." see [6] and [7], another evidence that feminism is a sham and that women sexually only want strong dominant men, not equal partners.)
4. You should have a good lover/provider balance, be a 'loving leader' to your wife (see <https://dicipres.wordpress.com/2012/02/02/a-crude-model/>).
5. Do not let the fear of divorce (and family courts) reduce your power within the marriage.
6. Marry a thin wife and have higher status than she have. This will satisfy the female no. 1 sexual demand of a high status man and your masculine no. 1 sexual demand of fertile sexy woman [5].

These are not easy demands, and there are probably many more, which also suggest the following interesting thought: today it is very hard to be a family man with and sustain a loving family and a strong marriage. Today, if you have enough status to be a strong family man, you probably also have enough status to be a player with a soft harem. This is a major shift from what was the case in the past where only the highest status men could be "players" and most regular men could easily lead a family. Today some man can do both and some cannot do either.

References

1. <http://family.jrank.org/pages/1094/Marital-Quality-Trends-in-Reported-Marital-Happiness.html>
2. <http://socialpathology.blogspot.com/2010/09/sexual-partner-divorce-risk.html>
3. <http://newsone.com/nation/newsonestaff2/report-72-percent-of-african-american-babies-born-to-unwed-mothers/>
4. <http://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol10/5/10-5.pdf>
5. <http://news.discovery.com/human/thinner-wife-happier-marriage-110725.html>
6. <http://onlinedatingpost.com/archives/2010/02/sextistics-your-sex-stats/>
7. <http://www.hookingupsmart.com/>
8. <http://socialpathology.blogspot.com/2012/03/sexual-history-divorce-risk-ii.html>

Marijuana, Black Boys and the Future of America

dicipres · 13 March 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Recently, the Journal of Family and Marriage published the article: [The Effects of Family Structure on African American Adolescents' Marijuana Use](#)

Abstract: *"The relationship between family structure and marijuana use throughout adolescence was assessed among 1,069 African Americans from the NLSY. A model was also tested suggesting that the effects of family structure on marijuana use would be mediated by poverty, neighborhood quality, and adolescents' self-control. As most prior studies have found, family structure was not related to female adolescents' marijuana use. For young men, being raised with both biological parents was associated with less marijuana use throughout adolescence compared to those whose mothers never married, divorced early and never remarried, or divorced and remarried. Some support for the model was also found. We concluded that being raised without the presence of a biological father is a risk factor for marijuana use among young men, but African American young women from single-parent households have unique resources that protect them from marijuana use."* [emphasis mine]

Like virtually all modern social academic publications, this article reeks of feminism. However, the data is still useful from the MRM perspective. While only the case of marijuana use is examined, we can generalize this case to understand the entire process which created and now sustains the matriarchal welfare society in which most black boys are growing today. (e.g. [72% of black children are born to unwed mothers](#), and [66% of black children are growing in single parent households](#).)

If we generalize the results of the article, we can deduce the following conclusion: **Growing in a home without a biological father hurts boys much more than it hurts girls.**

Welfare and feminism made it possible (and even worth while) to women to eliminate the biological father from the family. The lack of father figure hurts boys more than girls (as seen in the data), thus creating a class of young black men which are less educated, less disciplined and generally of lower social status compared to the young black women. Women hate weak low status men (see every post ever written by the mighty [Roissy](#)) and financially poor black men needed to get status by other means, e.g. become "bad boys". This in turn made them not attractive as husbands, and due to welfare and feminist family laws, they can just be removed completely from the family structure and the lives of the children at the will of mother, even without he hit me!/he abuse the kids!/etc.. false accusations. (This occur while they still providing child support for 18 years, and they have no say how their money is spent or how their children are raised.) The new generation of young boys have even less contact with a father figure, and thus will have a harder time to be fathers... and this is the cycle of life in the matriarchy. The cycle of [eliminating fathers from the family with is the most essential part required for a matriarchy](#).

This, made men, and specifically the "alpha" black men who were still desired by women, to think twice before marrying. Quoting [Ricketts, Erol. \(1989\) "The Origin of Black Female-Headed Families." Focus 12\(1\): 32-36 \(HT: JustBeAManAboutIt\)](#): *"The increasing vulnerability of disadvantaged black males to the vicissitudes of the economy seems to explain their avoidance of marriage and their increasing involvement in loose consensual unions. Being involved in such unions and parenting children out of wedlock are ways of simultaneously keeping one's options open and affirming one's self."*

A Prediction

The US, as a whole, is heading for the state of the black community today. Young men growing today need to understand this, and act accordingly, in a manner that will serve their best interests, while giving no consideration at all to the well being of the modern matriarchal society. If you still want a family you need to be associated with the part of society in which family values and marriage are still alive and well (middle class, white, earning well and college educated) and women which are still worth the risk of marriage (middle class, [low count of sexual partners](#) and [college educated](#)). This part of society and the population of "marriage worthy" women are shrinking by the

day and if you are poor/black/uneducated etc., you better prepare to live in the feminist new world order of society.

Some Other Comments

I. There was a black family in the past, Ricketts, Erol. 1989. "The Origin of Black Female-Headed Families." Focus 12(1): 32-36.)




Figure 1. Comparison of Marriage Patterns of Blacks and Whites, 1890-1980.

Source: Data from decennial censuses.

II. I was accused in my previous [post](#) to be pessimistic, and "downtrodden and defeatist" however, I believe that I am just a realist. In 1989 Ricketts commented in his conclusions: **"It is unlikely that these problems can be easily reversed, and they are likely to get worse..."** He was right.

III. Two interesting quotes from [the Mohikan report](#) (another H/T to JustBeAManAboutIt): 1. "From the wild Irish slums of the 19th century eastern seaboard, to the riot-torn suburbs of Los Angeles, there is one unmistakable lesson in American history: A community that allows a large number of young men to grow up in broken families, dominated by women, never acquiring any stable relationship to male authority, never acquiring any rational expectations about the future – that community asks for and gets chaos." 2. "My view is we had stumbled onto a major social change in the circumstances of post-modern society. It was not long ago in this past century that an anthropologist working in London – a very famous man at the time, Malinowski – postulated what he called the first rule of anthropology: That in all known societies, all male children have an acknowledged male parent. That's what we found out everywhere... And well, maybe it's not true anymore."

On Game and Men's Rights

dicipres · 25 March 2012 · Archived copy · Original

The manosphere consists of the two main factions: game/PUA groups and men's rights groups.

There was (and probably still is) some animosity between the two groups. Game/PUAs often viewed the MR as male feminists who blame the government and feminist laws on their own failings instead of working to improve their own lives. On the other hand, MRAs often viewed game/PUAs as creepy, childish, shallow, selfish, etc.

However, both groups seems to merge more and more into each other as more and more important game bloggers support MR goals ([Roissy](#), [Roosh](#), etc.). This occurred mainly due to the drunk sex = rape laws and divorce laws which affected game/PUAs, thus making them more sympathetic to MR causes. (Since the Game/PUA sphere is greater than the MR sphere by at least 10 to 1, and maybe even 100 to 1, game blogs are an excellent tool to spread MR issues affecting young men.)

This process should continue and these two groups should be connected, since they have deep inner similarities:

1. Both emanate from male frustrations. The quintessential PUA/Game is a man before marriage trying to navigate the modern sexual market place, while the quintessential MRA is a divorced father trying to navigate the family court system.
2. Both are extremely politically incorrect, to say that you are MR, or PUA/Game, supporter will not help get a job/make you popular/etc. (Infact, both MR and PUA/Game site were declared as 'hate sites'.)
3. Both groups consists of men who are basically trying to get more control over their lives and their environment in the face of rapid changes to our culture, declining social power and freedoms and the falling apart of the institute of family.

The men's movement should stand united. Our opposition is too well organized, enjoys too much government funding, gets too much academic support and enjoy too much public support for us to fight among ourselves.

Interesting Infidelity Statistics

dicipres · 10 April 2012 · Archived copy · Original

From an article entitled **THE EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY AND ECONOMICS OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND INFIDELITY**

by Donald Cox, Department of Economics Boston College:

“Rates of infidelity are indeed non-trivial: for instance one-quarter of all ever married men reported having had at least one extramarital affair.

- There exist marked sex differences in age patterns of infidelity. Women are far more likely to commit infidelity early in the relationship.*
- Cheating men are more likely than cheating women to have sex an affair with someone younger than their spouse. On the other hand, cheating women are more likely than cheating men to have an affair with someone better educated than their current spouse.*
- One possible interpretation of the pronounced prevalence of infidelity among younger women is that it reflects search for a new partner. Dictates of the biological clock suggest that, if a woman finds herself matched with an unsuitable partner, then she had better not procrastinate in seeking out a new mate, and extramarital affairs might reflect this search activity.*
- Indeed, as it turns out, outside evidence indicates that young women are far more likely than young men to initiate a divorce. If a spell of infidelity is little more than a stepping stone to a new relationship, its economic significance may well be quite small—a divorce was in the cards, and infidelity would merely be a consequence of a poor existing match.*
- Infidelity would be far more significant a problem, however, if cheaters had no intention of splitting from their spouses, something evolutionary psychologists call a “short-term” mating strategy. For instance, it has been posited that a poor woman, concerned about provisioning her offspring, might seek relations outside her marriage with the aim of garnering additional resources. Indeed, it turns out that poverty is correlated with infidelity among female respondents (but not among males).*
- However, there is little evidence that rich men are more prone to infidelity, counter to evolutionary-based claims that economically successful men are able to garner more than their fair share of mates.”*

From this work we see that men cheat with younger women and women cheat with more educated men. Men look for sexy bodies to carry their children and women look for good genes and high status. With all due respect to Prof. Cox work, I already read that at [Roissy's](#) blog.

Self-Soothing Lies Mothers Tell Themselves

dicipres · 13 April 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Did you ever heard a mother saying “it is better for the kids not to live in a home where the parents are fighting, I’m divorcing for the children sake!” and thus justifying herself for breaking up a family? (yes I know it can also be the father, but it is most often the mother filing for divorce, **70-90% of time the mother initiate the divorce.**)

Citing an article entitled “Is Making Divorce Easier Bad for Children? The Long-Run Implications of Unilateral Divorce” written by Jonathan Gruber and published in the **Journal of Labor Economics** , Vol. 22, No. 4 (October 2004), pp. 799-833:

“I assess the long-run implications for children of growing up in a unilateral divorce environment, which increases the ease of divorce by not requiring the explicit consent of both partners. Using 40 years of census data to exploit the variation across states and over time in changes in divorce regulation, I confirm that unilateral divorce regulations do significantly increase the incidence of divorce. Adults who were exposed to unilateral divorce regulations as children are less well educated, have lower family incomes, marry earlier but separate more often, and have higher odds of adult suicide.”

Hence, making divorce easier hurts children significantly. This should be read by every mother (or the father in the minority of cases) before breaking up a family and dragging their children through the hate filled mud of divorce.

It is better for your children to grow up in a home with both biological parents, even if they are fighting. The divorce serves the your personal interests, not your children. It is better for your children that the parents stay married. This is the truth, a disturbing uncomfortable truth, not a self soothing lie.

Women's Hypergamy and Men's Variety Seeking are the Same Thing

dicipres · 17 April 2012 · Archived copy · Original


In a perfect Cad society, there are no long term social contracts between men and women, and the mating is dominated by genetic interests:

- Women invest heavily when mating (pregnancy for 9 months, child-birth death risk, taking care of the baby for years, etc) and have a motivation be picky to get only the best genes from high-status men (hypergamy).
- Men invest only some sperm, and thus mating is always a good genetic deal for men. Men thus want to impregnate as many women as possible and are less picky (variety seeking).

In a perfect dad society, a woman has a social contract with a man to share resources and form a family unit to raise children. In a perfect dad society there are strong socially enforced life long social bonds between men and women, and the mating is dominated by maximizing parental investment in the children. This higher investment in children comes at the cost of:

- Women give up their genetic inclination to get the best genes and get a spouse (which is inevitably of equal ranking, see figure below) to support her and help raise her children. Women can't be hypergamous in a dad society.
- Men give up their genetic inclination to have multiple women and spread their genes (see figure below) and get an exclusive access to a single woman (this helps the low ranking men and hurts the high-ranking men). Men can't be variety seeking in a dad society.

However, when the social contracts between men and women are not enforced and without societal penalties for sexual behavior outside of marriages, the mating pattern reverts back to Cad-society where only few of the men mate with most of the women. In addition, men without societal penalties for sexual behavior outside of marriages will prefer to mate with multiple women (if they are high status) and not commit to a single woman.




This is what is happening today, as marriages disappear from the western world and men's parental investment is replaced by the government and the family courts.

Thus, women's hypergamy and men's variety seeking are the same thing, a genetic inclination, in the absence of a social bonds between men and women, to return to maximizing genetic interests at the expense of fatherhood.

The Dominant Gender is the Gender Facing More Variation in Reproductive Success

dicipres · 18 April 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Comparison to animals is always problematic, but this can be said to almost any other method of social analysis and the data in the figure below do make sense to me. Look at the following comparison of mating habits of three social mammals:




I draw from this illustration the following conclusion: **If one gender need to be more dominant in order to reproduce (compared with the other gender), it will be the dominant gender.** Hence, men's dominance is just a byproduct of harsher men's reproductive competition compared to women. Since **80% of women ever lived managed to reproduced compared with only 40% of men**, humans are more like lions, compared with wolves or hyenas.

Lets take another look at the figure I posted in my previous entry


Sexual freedom

Case I: Without socially enforced long term monogamous bonds between men and women (Cad society)



Regulated sexuality

Case II: Strict enforcement of life-long monogamous bonds between men and women (Perfect dad society)



You can see that sexually regulated “Perfect dad society” has similar reproductive challenges for men and women, and we thus expect that, if these social sexual regulations will remain for sufficient amount of time, an egalitarian society will be created. However, thanks to the sex-positive feminism and its me-me-me individualism as religion allies, we are reverting to cad society which will also sustain the current and even create more gender “inequality” (differences between men and women and more dominant men). Not that I care about that. I prefer dad society only because I believe it will be a better place for my children to live in. I love being a father and want my son to be able to experience fatherhood as well, instead of the modern Cad focused on fucking sluts in short term bonds and paying child support to children he (maybe) get to see only with court order twice a month.

Another, more cheerful conclusion is that **feminism contains the seeds for its own destruction.**

Sluts Don't Deserve to be Loved

dicipres · 25 April 2012 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

I know this headline might be offensive (oh nooooo), but I want to reassure you and begin this post by offering the following apology for choosing this headline.

An apology for the people offended by the headline

If this makes you feel bad it is probably because you're a slut yourself and really don't deserve to ever be loved. You are just a worthless piece of meat, so basically go fuck yourself (oh... you're already doing that).

End of apology

After this heartfelt apology, let's get back to the subject at hand. First, I want to clarify what I mean by love. I don't mean sex-in-the-city cock carousal (as a cock or a rider) and it's not a PUA gaming a girls for a ONS. When I'm talking about love I mean the real deal, a life-long strong bond between a man and a woman, being faithful and dedicated to each other, raising children and making a family, etc...

As a man, when you choose somebody to love, you need to be aware that everything might (and commonly do) explode in your face and the feminist family court system would make you into a slave for your ex-wife, you might lose control of your money and have a limited access to your children, and many other horror stories. (BTW, my own father went to prison, lost his shop and was homeless for a while after the divorce. These are not just crazy manosphere stories.)

As a man, you need to minimize this risk as much as possible.

Men have an innate emotional revulsion from bonding with promiscuous women. The feminist society today just pressures men to marry sluts, otherwise, you just might be labeled primitive/small dick/any other feminist shaming technique. But the revulsion in your guts is right, men have intuition as well, sluts don't deserve to be loved, sexually experienced women are only good for sexual experiences, they don't worth the risks to have any emotional bonds with.

Look at the following data:

1. From [Divorce and Sexual Risk Among U.S. Women: Findings from the National Survey of Family Growth](#)
Quote "Overall, 13.1% of the women were currently divorced or separated, 62.1% were currently married, 8.3% were cohabitating, and 16.4% were never married. Divorced/separated women were more likely to report 5 or more lifetime sex partners and 2 or more sex partners in the past year than never married women. They were less likely to report condom use."

Conclusion – More than 5 sexual partners for a woman significantly reduces her likelihood to form a stable married.

2. [Teachman, J. \(2003\), Premarital Sex, Premarital Cohabitation, and the Risk of Subsequent Marital Dissolution Among Women. Journal of Marriage and Family, 65: 444–455. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00444.x](#)

Quote – "Using nationally representative data from the 1995 National Survey of Family Growth, I estimate the association between intimate premarital relationships (premarital sex and premarital cohabitation) and subsequent marital dissolution. I extend previous research by considering relationship histories pertaining to both premarital sex and premarital cohabitation. I find that premarital sex or premarital cohabitation that is limited to a woman's husband is not associated with an elevated risk of marital disruption. However, women who have more than one intimate premarital relationship have an increased risk of marital dissolution. These results suggest that neither premarital sex nor premarital cohabitation by itself indicate either preexisting characteristics or subsequent

relationship environments that weaken marriages. Indeed, the findings are consistent with the notion that premarital sex and cohabitation limited to one's future spouse has become part of the normal courtship process for marriage."

Conclusion – The more sexual partners a woman have before the wedding the greater is the risk for a divorce

3. From <http://inductivist.blogspot.com/2011/01/premarital-sex-predicts-lower-quality.html>

(link is to the summary of a research, not the article itself)

Quote – "Now we the same kind of phenomenon with sexual intercourse. According to this study of 2,035 married people, waiting until after the wedding to have sex the first time is associated with greater subsequent communication, sexual quality, marital satisfaction, and perceived stability—see the above table for means. This was found after controlling for religiosity, race, income, education, and length of relationship."

Conclusion – Premarital sex predicts a lower quality marriage

4. From **THE EFFECTS OF PREMARITAL SEXUAL PROMISCUITY ON SUBSEQUENT MARITAL SEXUAL SATISFACTION** By Sherie Adams Christensen, Department of Marriage and Family Therapy

Quote – "Results indicate that for every additional premarital sexual partner an individual has, not including the marital sexual partner, the likelihood that they will say their current marital sexual relationship is extremely satisfying versus only being moderately satisfying goes down 3.9%. Additionally, when running models separately for males and females, the male model was more significant at 5.3%."

Conclusion – More premarital sex partners reduce the quality of the marriage (for men too BTW)

Sluts don't deserve to be loved, the risks are too great compared with the benefits. Men should avoid using sluts for anything but sex without emotional connection. If she had more than 5 sexual partners, move on.

Femininity is Masochistic, Masculinity is Sadistic

dicipres · 30 April 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Women are in pain every month of their fertile years. The loss of their virginity is very often painful. And when they are pregnant, and finally free from menstruation, they face the most essential right-of-passage of the feminine, giving birth, which is the most painful experience of being a woman.

These are all biological causes creating a connection between pain and femininity, but there are other social causes. Women are smaller and physically much weaker than men; they have been dominated by men for ages.

This connection between physical pain, being dominated and femininity must have permeated into the genes and souls of women living today. Quoting Oscar Wilde: *"I am afraid that women appreciate cruelty, downright cruelty, more than anything else. They have wonderfully primitive instincts. We have emancipated them, but they remain slaves looking for their masters all the same."* Since femininity and masculinity define each other, if femininity is masochistic, masculinity is sadistic (e.g. the vast majority of porn is about men using and dominating women). Which finally brings me to the point of this post:

A man must hurt the woman he loves.

This should be done with love, but must be done nonetheless. Your woman needs to be dominated and feel pain in order to truly fulfill her own sexuality. The problematic part here is to do it AND NOT be abusive or violent. Dominating and hurting a woman is a lover quality, not a provider quality, (actually, a provider would do the opposite and act to protect his woman from hurt) and you must find a balance in this contradiction between being **lover and provider**.

Evidence of Marriage Strike?

dicipres · 1 May 2012 · Archived copy · Original

This post is not part of the guide, but just some interesting statistics about marriages.

From Pew Research center ([link to report](#)):

“The share of young men (ages 18 to 34) who say that having a successful marriage is one of the most important things in their lives has dropped six percentage points since 1997, from 35% to 29%. For women, the opposite effect occurred, as the share voicing this opinion rose from 28% to 37%.

This gender gap is a new development, as men and women were statistically equal on this measure in 1997.”

Conclusion: Compared with the past, young men care less about marriage, and young women care more about marriage.

The report don't say anything about the reasons, but maybe the **marriage strike is indeed real**. Perhaps, family courts, feminist divorce laws and the elimination of slut shaming did had a major effect on how young men in the west view marriage. For me, family is a sacred thing. But I can still be amazed from time to time of the risks people, and especially men, take when they invest so much love, time and money (in fact, the vast majority of their love, time and money) in an institution which can and often do explodes in their faces with shrapnel made of infidelity, cuckoldry, false DV accusations, alimony and child support while seeing your children every other week.

Biological Insanity and the Way of the Patriarch

dicipres · 4 May 2012 · Archived copy · Original

In nature, every action by every animal is highly influenced by the genes of the animal and every action by every animal is highly related to ensuring the propagation of animal's genes. If we look at ourselves, the world in which we live in has changed very rapidly in the last thousand years, yet our genes barely changed during this time. This inconsistency between rapidly changing surroundings and slowly changing genes makes humans do things which are insane from a biological perspective.

This insanity is manifested in numerous actions made by modern humans. A simple example to this insanity is paying a prostitute to have sex with you and using a condom. The reason you want to have sex with the prostitute emanates from your genes which entice you to have sex with the prostitute by injecting chemicals to your brain. Your genes are designed to a world without contraceptives and 'think' that you will impregnate the prostitute and thus ensure the propagation of your genes. However, in reality the chances of impregnating the prostitute are zero, since you live in a world with contraceptives. You are futility wasting resources and making a biologically insane action.

You can say that you don't care about your genes and pay to have sex with the prostitute... but basically you are still following genetic instructions given to you in the form of pleasure by your out-of-date genes. You say you don't care about your genes, but you are very much controlled by them. If you go against your genes, and consciously act to make rational biological decisions, your genes will have better chance of propagating, but you might be less 'happy' since your out-of-date genes will punish you by taking away pleasure.

The basic question here is: Where do 'we' begin and where our genes end?

Many solutions to this question easily lead to nihilism. The approach of the Guide to the Young Patriarch is clearly expressed in the Principle Patriarchal Value:

A genetic lineage is of the utmost importance to a patriarch.

If you want to take the red pill and look at the world as it is, consciously making rational biological decisions is the only sane solution. It is disturbing like many other red pill realizations, but it is true all the same. All other approaches lead to an abyss of insanity. Ironically, since society often define sanity as being 'normal' (i.e. acting like others), at times the insane masses might blame a man following this path of having their vice.

Men's Innate Sexual Value is Zero

dicipres · 10 May 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Sperm is biologically cheap, any male can produce many throughout his adult life. However, eggs, pregnancy and breast-feeding of a child is biologically very expensive and limited to women of good health during their fertile years. Thus, women have allot more sexual value to offer to men than men have to offer to women.

For this reason a woman can sell her body to men, while a man cannot sell his body to women. For this reason society required that men protect women and not the other way around. For this reason men are not picky regarding casual sex (paying sperm and getting eggs, pregnancy and breast-feeding is a good deal for any man) while women much more picky.

Women have an innate sexual value, even if they are weak and dumb, fertile women always 'worth' allot. This sexual value can be estimated easily in the hundreds of thousands of dollars or more for just a regular woman. As a man your innate sexual value is zero, you must earn your sexual value through your virtues and power.

Quoting Camilla Paglia – *“A woman simply is, but a man must become. Masculinity is risky and elusive. It is achieved by a revolt from woman, and is confirmed only by other men. Feminist fantasies about the ideal “sensitive” male have failed. Manhood coerced into sensitivity is no manhood at all.”*

A Patriarch cannot just smile and be nice. A Patriarch must earn, guard and enforce his masculinity.

The Current Draft of the Guide

dicipres · 16 May 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Writing takes time, and having constant pressure at work and small children at home, I don't really have free time for it. Still, little by little, progress is made.

The last draft of the 'Guide for a Young Patriarch' is now about 10,000 words and still I have allot more to say about red pill awareness and allot more to say to young men wanting love and family as well a fulfillment of their masculinity in the minefield which is the post-feminist post-sexual revolution western world.

Here is a link to the latest version (pdf, 15/May/2012)

Draft of the Guide to a Young Patriarch

which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message. Any comments, suggestions or typos (which are probably common since English is not my native tongue) are welcome.

An Abyss of Emptiness is Revealed When the Red Pill Kills the Beautiful Lies

dicipres · 18 May 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Truly taking the red pill is a painful experience. It cut through the things we care about the most:

Relationships (Game/PUA) – The red pill reveals the mechanical, predictable and self-serving nature of sexual attraction and love. Love is just a collection of mechanical parts, acting together to achieve reproduction.

Women – The first time you learn the truth about women, e.g. read statistics about cuckolding and how women are **hardwired to such behaviors, the masochistic nature of women, etc.**

Gender Politics – Women have the majority of votes and, via collaboration with white knights, care mainly about women and dictate the social agenda accordingly (including when to send young men to their death).

Modern Marriage – A very significant and real risk of huge financial and emotional losses due to family courts, which today regulated fatherhood for a large percentage of children.

Ourselves – We are controlled by our genes, which are out-of-date, and entice us to biologically insane decisions. (Nobody sees this insanity because everyone else is insane as well.) We are puppets of our genes which manipulate us by our emotions to achieve reproduction.

Most people know about at least part of these subjects, but they are not really aware. They have some information through science and statistical data, but they choose to ignore the implications and just keep on as usual as another animal in the herd. Truly understanding the implications of the red pill, being aware, removes the lies from our eyes but what is left behind is emptiness.

No one writes about these things in the newspapers, no one directs a movie about the way genes control you and love is a chemical action. In fact, what you do see in art, news and movies are more and more beautiful glorious lies about superheros and magical love and justice. The beauty and power of the lies is amazing, sometimes it can make you wonder why do you even care about the truth. Why do you insist on controlling your emotions and follow the logic of your mind, when all you see is gray, ugly and selfish.

However, a young Patriarch must strive for power and knowledge so that he can have control over his surroundings and relationships. Besides, I promise you this, the initial disappointment and pain, and maybe the feeling that it is not worth it, will go away. Our genes calibrate our emotions, so they are relative, not absolute. And after you come to terms with the red pill you would have a better model of the world and thus you will have more power and could operate more efficiently.

*(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the **Guide for a Young Patriarch** which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)*

A Genuine Alpha

dicipres · 24 May 2012 · Archived copy · Original

(not part of the guide, just a small observation)

From <http://blogs.ajc.com/news-to-me/2012/05/21/father-of-30-struggles-to-pay-child-support/>

“Hatchett, a minimum wage worker from Knoxville, recently asked the court for help in making his child support payments. The 33-year-old man has fathered 30 children by 11 women and is having trouble keeping up with the bills.”

This guy is 33 years old and have 30 kids, he is definitely a winner of some sort since he beat another 10 men and basically monopolized the wombs of 11 women. Note that he is not especially good-looking and has a low status job. This guy is the incarnation of ALPHA in a CAD society.

Oh... do you think he is a burden on the state? are you mad that you must pay taxes to finance his seed? angry that the fatherless children will run amok and that you will need to finance their expensive incarceration? think that he is just an irresponsible asshole?

Well, he is alpha nonetheless.

“Honey, what do you need me to do?”

dicipres · 29 May 2012 · Archived copy · Original

As mentioned in [A Crude Model For the Bond Between a Man and a Woman](#):

“The relationship between a man and a woman can be reduced to two basic bonds as providers and as lovers...” where **“a good provider (male or female) is a good teammate in the family team”** and **“a good male lover has higher status than the female and a good female lover is sexually attractive.”**

Generally, doing work in the house, to help in raising children, to clean and cook for your family, etc, are related to a provider bonds. Doing these things can be a good thing and help the bond. However, frame and cultural context can make such works low status and thus anti-lover and hurt attraction.

If you do these provider works, you must control the frame of your behavior so as not to hurt you lover status.

The call “Honey, what do you need me to do?” is the call of the beta.

It signals willingness to follow commands and having lower status compared to your woman. Women sexually despise lower-status men. Do it for a couple of years and you can significantly erode the attraction between you and your wife. She will see you as low-status and unworthy of her sexuality and you will resent her for ‘lowering’ you status.

However, provider behavior is positive and often required to within long-term bonds, especially in families with small children. In order to ease this conflict, **you need to control the frame**. As a man you should never be told to do things around the house, however, if you think it is appropriate, you can decide to take charge of part of the house duties (e.g. cooking breakfasts). You can make everybody in the house to clean, have dinner, etc if you think it is required. To be involved and make decisions around the house is not beta. By controlling the frame and leading, not following, you can do provider behavior without hurting lover-status. Thereby, helping diffuse the lover/provider conflict which is one of the major issues in LTRs.

(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the [Guide for a Young Patriarch](#) which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)

The Virtue of Courage

dicipres · 1 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

The virtue of courage is a specific form of the **prime virtue of self-discipline**. Courage is not reckless stupidity, or the absence of fear. Courage is the willingness to take action which you analyzed as the most preferable to your interests, even if this action involves risks and a (real or imaginary) possibility of pain or loss.

Courage represents the victory of logic over feelings, victory of conscious decision-making over unconscious fears. This is a defining victory of masculinity. In fact, no other virtue is so strongly associated with masculinity. Today many of our fears are imaginary and emanate from our **out-of-date genes**, however, courage is needed nonetheless to overcome the feelings associated with our fears, even if we consciously understand that our fears are logically baseless.

Like all virtues, developing this virtue requires self-discipline. There are two approaches which are beneficial and both are required. First, follow the way religions indoctrinate their followers and indoctrinate your mind with virtues of your choosing. This means to **write the virtues** and recite them daily. The **second approach** is to make this virtue a habit. Be courageous enough times and it will become part of you.

As a young Patriarch you need to follow both approaches and make sure you possess the virtue of courage. Again, this does not mean to be reckless, it means to make logical actions in the face of fears. Being courageous gives a Patriarch more power and control over himself, his relationships and his surroundings. Courage is a cornerstone of masculinity, is it highly beneficial to achieving power. A Patriarch is courageous by definition, if you are not courageous you are not a Patriarch.

*(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the **Guide for a Young Patriarch** which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)*

Dear Nihilist, Your Happiness is Also Meaningless

dicipres · 7 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Here in the manosphere, the red-pill rules, relationships and love are ruthlessly dismantled into nuts and bolts, morals are shown for the lies that they are, a 'good man' is shown to be only a man weak enough to allow himself to be exploited by society and women.

To this godless point of view, nihilism seems to be the inevitable conclusion and thus hedonism is close by. Hence, we are told by just about every other blogger here to exploit the destruction of the old social contracts and the elimination of gender roles, to enjoy the freedom associated with the ever creeping death of fatherhood, to exploit the newly invented feminist morals of equality and diversity, and specifically, above anything else, to exploit the sexual revolution, i.e. ONS with the sluts who constitute the majority of western women today.

However, as we are becoming more aware and choose to disconnect from the new feminist social morals as well as the old morals of god, we are not really freer. In fact, we just become more faithful and dedicated slaves to our emotions, to our genes, which are the only mechanism left to control us. Jumping through hoops for ONS with another worthless slut (ONS which is emptied from its connection to reproduction) is insanity not freedom. Furthermore, often the desire for ONS is not mainly due to sexual desire but represents a pathetic need for validation of young men, in the absence of any other moral structure and social contracts, to be like the people on T.V and have sex lives like they have.

If you take the red-pill, take it all the way and look in the mirror. What you feel is just another biological control mechanism, just like religion and social morals, nothing more. Blindly following your 'happiness' is not more meaningful or truer than following god, even if god himself is a lie. This jail of 'feelings' is the hardest jail to escape from, in fact, although you can sometimes leave the jail, you can never be truly free of it.

Young men today need to build something that is more, a resurrection of the Patriarchy based not on blind intuition like the Patriarchs of the past, but on a deeper and better understanding of reproduction, biology and our world in general, self-discipline and a resolution to survive, not run away MGTOW style.

(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the [Guide for a Young Patriarch](#) which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)

“All Power Comes from the Muzzle of a Gun”

dicipres · 9 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

The capability to apply violence is one of the foundations of masculinity. Masculinity innately involves dominance and power, **both are related to**, and induced by, testosterone. Power emanates from capability for violence (in its various forms). When you ask ‘why’ (about anything) enough times you will reach nihilism. Similarly, when you question the origins of power enough times you will reach to the muzzle of somebody’s gun.

The authority of the state regarding its land and resources is, in practice, enforced by its army, not by made-up morals or by biblical justifications. The authority of every boss you that ever made you miserable came from violence, and was enforced indirectly by police, not moral values. The authority of feminism over men today, the fact that modern women allow themselves to threaten men, **giggle to the destruction of masculinity**, and separate them from their wealth and children, similarly comes from their capability of violence, happily provided by mentally enslaved (usually) male drones wearing ridiculous police/army costumes.

When a thug, who is commonly a fatherless boy of the feminist-created single-mother welfare matriarchy, turns violent he rebels against his police-enforced position in the hierarchy. By yielding the muzzle himself, the thug can be powerful for few brief moments and create fear, the most honest form of respect, within his superiors. The personal capability for violence represents an ability to cheat the organized violence by feminism/politics/police and immediately achieve power.

As a Patriarch you must have the ability to apply violence yourself, even if you will, hopefully, never need to use it. Having this virtue changes the dynamics of relationships, and moisten vaginas. Women, with accordance to their biological agendas, which is manifested in their masochistic sexuality, are drawn to men that have the capability to hurt them (by themselves or by proxy) and sexually despise the weaker controllable males.

Remember, like it or not, inside every man there is an ancient ruthless killer. Explore and master this part in you, don’t suppress it or fear it, control it and be in peace with it. The killer is a crucial part of your sexuality.

*(I. This post was re-edited after publication. II. For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 16/Jun/2012) of the **Guide for a Young Patriarch** which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)*

Biological and Cultural Genes, Feminism as a Genetic Disease

dicipres · 13 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

The double helix and the holy bible. Both are filled with letters, one with the four biological letters and the other with the letters of the human language. The data contained in the holy bible can be described as cultural information. This concept can be generalized, and any non-biological data a person contains or interacts with can be described as cultural information. We are comprised from these two sets of data and their physical manifestations to our bodies, our behavior and eventually our societies.

The data contained in the holy bible has some similarities with the data contained in our genes. Both sets of data act to self-preserve and duplicate themselves. This can be seen clearly when the religious emissaries knock at your door, or talk with you in the middle of the street and ask you how you feel about god. The religious information act on the people who contain it and they, in turn, act to duplicate it within the minds of others. In this perspective, the information contained in the holy bible is a life form, acting within the set of human minds to self-preserve and duplicate, just like the information within a gene acts to self-preserve and duplicate. The information within the holy bible has physical manifestations, religious people actually build entire societies based on the set of data contained in the holy bible, just like the data contained in biological genes is physically manifested as functional molecules which create our bodies.

The holy bible is a gene, a cultural gene. In fact, it is one of many cultural genes (e.g. Marxism, Nazism, Liberalism, Individualism, Feminism) which act on the human mind in order to self-preserve and duplicate and have physical manifestations in our world.

The interaction between the biological genes and the 'holy bible cultural gene' is interesting. If the 'holy bible cultural gene' would have been harmful to our biological genes, the minds containing it would have physically disappeared. However, almost every human society involves religion in one form or the other. In Judaism, of the Jewish 613 Mitzvot, to procreate is the first, representing a complete alignment between the biological and cultural genes (see the **first patriarchal value**). The Rabbi of the synagogue close to our house has 8 children, the majority of the people going to the synagogue have much fewer children, even though most of them are much more rich compared with the Rabbi. Looking at the child-bearing data, it is evident that religion exists in symbiosis with our biological genes, it is helped by us and is helping us, our families, our children and our societies. (BTW1, The actual existence of god is irrelevant to the current discussion. The effects of religion on humanity are true even if god is a lie. BTW2, I'm talking about real 'old school' religions, not the new modern BS pretending to be religion.)

Feminism is another cultural gene, feminists similarly act to make everybody a feminist and to change society according to the feminist set of data. Feminism achieved much of this very rapidly since nearly all western women are infected with feminism (via innate tribal identity which is transferred to gender identity through feminist propaganda) and since women are the majority of voters. Together with its equally destructive sister cultural gene of individualism, feminism acts to destroy families and make men and women into single atoms without any dependence on each other and, above all, feminism reduces child-bearing (in favor of big careers for women). Feminism is not in alignment with our biological genes. It is a parasite poisoning the human mind and in contrast with our biological agenda. Feminism delays child births and reduce the total number of children (I never met a feminist with 8 children). In many cases, feminism can bring the demise of its carriers in just a single generation by the creation of yet another childless feminist. I won't exactly cry for the demise of the spinster feminist, at the very least it is obviously preferable to next feminist option of having a child without a father in matriarchal single parent home oh so common in the post-feminist world.

*(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the **Guide for a Young Patriarch** which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)*

Interesting papers

dicipres · 19 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

From Evolution & Human Behavior **Volume 33, Issue 4** , Pages 357-364, July 2012

Title: “Low serum vitamin A mothers breastfeed daughters more often than sons in drought-ridden northern Kenya: a test of the Trivers–Willard hypothesis”

Abstract: “The Trivers–Willard hypothesis predicts that natural selection should favor unequal parental investment between daughters and sons based upon maternal condition and offspring reproductive potential. Specifically, it predicts that mothers in good condition should increase investment toward sons, while mothers in poor condition should favor daughters. Previous tests of the hypothesis in human populations overwhelmingly focused on economic resources as maternal condition indicators. We test the Trivers–Willard hypothesis using maternal nutrition—energy and vitamin A status representing macro- and micronutrition, respectively—as the indicator for maternal condition, with breastfeeding frequency recalls serving as the indicator for parental investment. Data from exclusively breastfeeding mothers ($n=83$) in drought-ridden Ariaal agropastoral villages of northern Kenya were used to test the hypothesis that mothers in poor condition will breastfeed daughters more frequently than sons. Poor condition was defined as having a body mass index <18.5 or serum retinol (vitamin A) concentration $<1.05 \mu\text{mol/l}$. A linear regression model was applied using breastfeeding frequency as the dependent variable and respective maternal condition, infant’s sex, and the maternal condition–infant’s sex interaction as the predictors, controlling for covariates. Results supported the hypothesis only in the vitamin A model which predicts that low-vitamin-A mothers breastfeed daughters significantly more frequently than sons (11 vs. 6 times/day), while vitamin-A-sufficient mothers breastfeed daughters and sons equivalently (9 times). These results indicate that maternal nutritional status, particularly micronutrient status, can contribute to the investigation of the evolutionary hypothesis of sex-biased parental investment.”

Basically, poor low status women invest more in their girls and richer high status women invest more in their boys. Maybe it is related to the high failure of boys, compared to girls, in low status families.

From: Evolution & Human Behavior **Volume 33, Issue 4** , Pages 268-273, July 2012

Title: “Low nonpaternity rate in an old Afrikaner family”

Abstract: “Extrapair paternity is a crucial parameter for evolutionary explanations of reproductive behavior. Early studies and human testis size suggest that human males secure/suffer frequent extrapair paternity. If these high rates are indeed true, it brings into question studies that use genealogies to infer human life history and the history of diseases since the recorded genealogies do not reflect paths of genetic inheritance. We measure the rate of nonpaternity in an old Afrikaner family in South Africa by comparing Y-chromosome short tandem repeats to the genealogy of males. In this population, the nonpaternity rate was 0.73%. This low rate is observed in other studies that matched genealogies to genetic markers and more recent studies that also find estimates below 1%. It may be that imposed religious morals have led to reduced extrapair activities in some historic populations. We also found that the mutation rate is high for this family, but is unrelated to age at conception.”

They had cuckolding rate of 0.73%, before the pill/abortion/or the fear of paternity tests. This is quite amazing considering to order of magnitude greater cuckolding rate of ~5% to 10% common today. Religion helps prevent cuckolding, which gives men more paternity certainty, which makes it worthwhile for them to invest in the children... God might be a lie, but religion is one of the strongest tools to shape healthy human societies.

(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the [Guide for a Young Patriarch](#) which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)

The Asians-Americans will Fall with the Rest of Us

dicipres · 20 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

(not part of the guide, just a small observation)

From [pew social trends report 'the-rise-of-asian-americans'](#)

"They [Asian-Americans] also stand out for their strong emphasis on family. More than half (54%) say that having a successful marriage is one of the most important things in life; just 34% of all American adults agree. Two-thirds of Asian-American adults (67%) say that being a good parent is one of the most important things in life; just 50% of all adults agree.

Their living arrangements align with these values. They are more likely than all American adults to be married (59% vs. 51%); their newborns are less likely than all U.S. newborns to have an unmarried mother (16% vs. 41%); and their children are more likely than all U.S. children to be raised in a household with two married parents (80% vs. 63%)."

Asians are more educated, make more money, have stronger families and are twice less likely to be raised without a father. Good for them. Looking on the devastating effects of fatherless children (see [the indispensability of fathers](#) and [the decline in fatherhood and the male identity crisis](#)), we can reasonably assume that much of their success comes from the fact that they have strong families who support their children, on average, more than any other group.

However, the report gives another statistic, which suggests that the Asian family (on average) to be vulnerable to the effects of westernization of their original family and community values by the modern feminism, sexual revolution, individualism and the church of reality TV.

Again citing [pew social trends report 'the-rise-of-asian-americans'](#)

"About three-in-ten (31%) U.S.-born Asian women who had children recently are unmarried, compared with just 10% of all recent foreign-born Asian-American mothers. Among the U.S. population as a whole, about four-in-ten recent American mothers are unmarried."

For Asian women born in the US the out-of-wedlock rate is about 31% (over three times the rate of foreign born Asian women). This is pretty close to the US average of 40%. The relative success of Asian-Americans, compared with other groups, is due to strong families, the basic building block of society. However, they are deteriorating, just like the rest of us, to a hedonistic atomic society without any functioning community. They will fall like everybody else, maybe slower, but still they will fall.

BTW, A Racist Hypothesis: Male chimps have large genitalia compared to their bodies and male gorillas have small genitalia compared to their bodies. Female chimps 'cuckolds'/cheat/promiscuous more compared with female gorillas. From [why do male chimpanzees have bigger testicles compared to humans and gorillas also have tiny ones](#) "sperm count [which is related to testes size] is a good indicator of how secure a male is in the love of a good female primate."

There is no good way to say it, *Asian men have small balls* -> which maybe indicates that Asian women are more faithful -> which may be a reason to their stronger families and overall success.

(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the [Guide for a Young Patriarch](#) which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)

Small Irony?

dicipres · 24 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

(not part of the guide, just a small observation)

The interests of feminism focus on work, money and climbing the hierarchical ladder at work, traditionally men's domain. The men's movement focus is on the state of the family, custody laws and parenthood, traditionally women's domain.

If, by Rudyard Kipling

dicipres · 25 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

“If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting too:
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or, being lied about, don’t deal in lies,
Or being hated don’t give way to hating,
And yet don’t look too good, nor talk too wise;

If you can dream—and not make dreams your master;
If you can think—and not make thoughts your aim,
If you can meet with Triumph and Disaster
And treat those two impostors just the same:.
If you can bear to hear the truth you’ve spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
And stoop and build’em up with worn-out tools;

If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings,
And never breathe a word about your loss:
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you
Except the Will which says to them: “Hold on!”

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with Kings—nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
If all men count with you, but none too much:
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds’ worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that’s in it,
And—which is more—you’ll be a Man, my son!”

This poem is about a father guiding his son. It is advice from a time when a father figure was required in every house, a time when men and women took pride in fulfilling their gender roles and created a strong foundation for their families and societies, a time when the vast majority of our children were raised by two biological parents, a time when people did not identify with their gender like a nationalist identify with his tribe. The past was not perfect or ideal, but the past had values which created and sustained civilizations for thousands of years. If we want to be free of the newly made up lies and social theories of elite ivy-league universities, we need to turn to the old values. They have many things to teach us about ourselves, and they were validated by time, not the modern values of our social elite.

(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the [Guide for a Young Patriarch](#) which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)

Tyranny in Democracy and Democracy in Dictatorship

dicipres · 28 June 2012 · Archived copy · Original

(not part of the guide, just a small observation)

If the people have access to the muzzle of guns in sufficient quantities, so as to threaten the government in case of significant civilian discontent, there is an indirect 'democratic' effect in action. This effect applies to any country and any form of government, even to dictatorships. Violence does not have to occur in order to a person or a group capable of violence to gain power due to this capability, the unmentionable threat of violence is enough in many cases.

Think about Ghandi and Martin Luther King, while their names are commonly used to show how 'peaceful' non-violent civil disobedience protests can be effective, both had much more violent options backing them (e.g. Malcolm X types and radical Indian nationalists) ready to shed blood if the 'peaceful' negotiations fail.

If there are such 'democratic' effects in dictatorships, is it possible to have 'tyrannical' effects in a democracy? Is the financing and monetary support of presidential candidates by corporations has a 'tyrannical' effect?, the power wealthy people have over the media?, or maybe the way the system is built to reduce the power of any political candidate outside of the democratic/republican binary?

Is, in certain cases, the difference between democracy and tyranny smaller than we think?

(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the [Guide for a Young Patriarch](#) which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)

The Charge of the Light Brigade, by Alfred Tennyson

dicipres · 1 July 2012 · Archived copy · Original

“Half a league, half a league,
Half a league onward,
All in the valley of Death
Rode the six hundred.
“Forward the Light Brigade!
Charge for the guns!” he said.
Into the valley of Death
Rode the six hundred.

Forward, the Light Brigade!”
Was there a man dismay’d?
Not tho’ the soldier knew
Some one had blunder’d.
Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die.
Into the valley of Death
Rode the six hundred.

Cannon to right of them,
Cannon to left of them,
Cannon in front of them
Volley’d and thunder’d;
Storm’d at with shot and shell,
Boldly they rode and well,
Into the jaws of Death,
Into the mouth of hell
Rode the six hundred.

Flash’d all their sabres bare,
Flash’d as they turn’d in air
Sabring the gunners there,
Charging an army, while
All the world wonder’d.
Plunged in the battery-smoke
Right thro’ the line they broke;
Cossack and Russian
Reel’d from the sabre-stroke
Shatter’d and sunder’d.
Then they rode back, but not,
Not the six hundred.

Cannon to right of them,
Cannon to left of them,
Cannon behind them
Volley’d and thunder’d;
Storm’d at with shot and shell,

While horse and hero fell,
They that had fought so well
Came thro' the jaws of Death,
Back from the mouth of hell,
All that was left of them,
Left of six hundred.

When can their glory fade?
O the wild charge they made!
All the world wonder'd.
Honor the charge they made!
Honor the Light Brigade,
Noble six hundred!"

What motivates such behavior? why honor was important to these men?

At the age of 18 I stood in a small office in a military base. I had to look on several words and choose one. I chose 'infantry'. Why would anybody choose this option when easier and safer options are available? I didn't know it then in my blue-pill days, or more accurately I knew it and was not aware of it. Like basically all other human behaviors, the true inner motivation for my decision emanated from sex and reproduction. Young men would do crazy things to prove their sexual value and masculinity, and what better way is to prove you're a man than doing something women can't.

Today, police enforced state feminism methodically acts to destroy any bastion of masculinity, any boys only club is demonized (the US president himself had time to deal with a 'mighty' men only golf club). The politically correct brain thought police requires that there is nothing that men can do that women can't. When reality deviates from this, they claim discrimination and bend the system to accommodate women.

This is feminism's way to suppress **Jack Donovan's gangs of men**. But should we care? In a way, the army utilized men's need to affirm their masculinity to the goals of the state. The army, and the state in general, will be less effective without utilizing men's masculinity, and even less effective after replacing design for maximum efficiency by design allowing diversity. Within a gang, honor is closely related to a man social and sexual status. However, honor as a virtue has no meaning outside a gang of men, without this context and in an atomized society, honor is a vice, a weakness, not a virtue.

A gang of men should only act to protect itself, not to serve others. The western state is not a gang of men anymore. In fact, the western state hates and fights to eliminate gangs of men and **it is thus not worthy to be protected by gangs of men**.

Conflict is Unavoidable

dicipres · 6 July 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Taking power away from men is the ultimate goal of feminism, exemplified by the feminist motto of ‘smashing patriarchy’. Patriarchy is power held by men, and specifically fathers over their families. Under feminist ideology all problems emanate from men having power, and without male dominance utopia will be created.

However, masculinity and male sexuality are immutably linked to power and status. (This can be physically observed in the libido and testosterone male traders after making **significant profits**). A weak man cannot be genuinely sexual or masculine. and women are **sexually repulsed by weak men**. A low-level encorpera employee, desperate to keep his job and dependent upon the opinion of the CEO, cannot be masculine in the presence of the CEO.

Feminism, or ‘equality’, is thus equivalent to a slow castration of the Western man. Masculinity is not equal to femininity. Masculinity it is not being nice, or good, or beneficial to others, it is the ability to dominant (in various ways), physical power, and the ability to inflict violence. If men want to protect their sexuality, we need to protect our status and dominance in society.

A conflict is unavoidable.

*(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the **Guide for a Young Patriarch** which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)*

Richard Cory, by Edwin Arlington Robinson

dicipres · 9 July 2012 · Archived copy · Original

“Whenever Richard Cory went down town,
We people on the pavement looked at him:
He was a gentleman from sole to crown,
Clean favored, and imperially slim.

And he was always quietly arrayed,
And he was always human when he talked;
But still he fluttered pulses when he said,
‘Good-morning,’ and he glittered when he walked.

And he was rich – yes, richer than a king –
And admirably schooled in every grace:
In fine, we thought that he was everything
To make us wish that we were in his place.

So on we worked, and waited for the light,
And went without the meat, and cursed the bread;
And Richard Cory, one calm summer night,
Went home and put a bullet through his head.”

There are many interpretations to this poem, some simple and trivial (i.e. money and status don't equal happiness) and some more complex and speculative. The message of the Guide for a Young Patriarch regarding happiness yields a very simple interpretation of this poem. Since happiness is the method your genes apply to control your behavior (see **dear nihilist your happiness is also meaningless**), Richard Cory's story is just a story of defective/unadapted genes and another weak person completely controlled by his genes and happiness.

Dear Richard Cory had everything he needed, but still, the masters of his life made him miserable and suicidal. He was too weak to escape. He probably had the ability to think logically but his defective/unadapted genes made him kill himself for no worthy cause. This just shows how pathetic and powerless it is to blindly follow your happiness.

Modern western culture glorifies happiness and thus gives the genes even more power over our lives. Viewing happiness as more important than any other value is one of the major themes of feminism and individualism (e.g. I'm unhaaaappy divorce, justification and legalization of infidelity, normalization of single parent households...).

Viewing values, order and genetic lineage as more important than happiness is a form of rebellion against the cult of individualism. The definition of freedom must include the most basic freedom to be able to act, knowing misery and pain will come to you, and still pursue your chosen action.

BTW: In many cases genes do contain valuable information, if your body hurts, it is probably for a reason, gut feelings are in many cases right (e.g. **disgust at disfigured people is a method to prevent disease**) even if the culture frowns upon it. However, we should be strong enough to overrule our genes when needed and know how to live in peace with the emotions created by our genes.

*(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the **Guide for a Young Patriarch** which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)*

Some words on Theodore Roosevelt

dicipres · 13 July 2012 · Archived copy · Original

In the last few weeks I've taken a break from updating the guide and I'm reading poems and books on men of the past, mainly to examine masculinity before the feminist ideological lies poisoned our culture and view on men and women (similarly to the work by [free northerner](#)). Currently, I'm reading the book 'Lion in the White House' on Theodore Roosevelt.


While Theodore Roosevelt is an amazing man (and he will be discussed later on) I want to make a comment on his father, Theodore Roosevelt Sr. From a manosphere perspective Theodore Roosevelt Sr. is a very interesting figure. He was both an absolute alpha man and a completely devoted father and husband, and he is in many cases the primary parent to his children. Today alpha male and a devoted father and husband sounds like contradictions. Reading about the loving family and strong dominant father figure Theodore Roosevelt had as a child, it is not surprising that Theodore Roosevelt grew into a lion.

BTW1. Theodore Roosevelt came from a long line of alpha patriarchs with multitude of virtues. The current president grew up without a father.

BTW2 .The feminist claim that feminism "improved" and enable better fatherhood is a huge lie. Feminism made the west into a fatherless society. The past wasn't perfect, but it was still better than the present.

"It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles or where the doer of deeds could have done better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who strives valiantly, who errs and comes up short again and again, because there is no effort without error or shortcoming, but who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, who spends himself for a worthy cause; who, at the best, knows, in the end, the triumph of high achievement, and who, at the worst, if he fails, at least he fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who knew neither victory nor defeat."

— Theodore Roosevelt



Theodore Roosevelt at Harvard where he participated in boxing matches... I wonder what Heartiste would analyze his body language.

(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the [Guide for a Young Patriarch](#) which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)

Masculinity and the State

dicipres · 17 July 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Feminists, utilizing democracy and the fact they are the majority of voters, easily dismantle one masculine institution after the other. Recently, Price wrote about this phenomenon with regard to the [American Army](#). I served three years in the Israeli army as an infantry soldier and can share my observations on the effects of feminism on the IDF.

The so-called “prestige” of the Israeli army comes mainly from the wars waged from 1948 to 1982 where Israel was not supported by the US, had a weak economy and fought against multiple enemies. During that time the IDF was a huge part of Israel and Israeli men developed rugged masculinity and bravado unheard of for the timid Jews in exile. Unlike the common conception, only extreme minority of combat soldiers are or were women (probably 0.1% to 1%). Civilians tend to assume that any person in uniform and with a rifle is a heroic soldier, where in fact 90% of soldiers in any modern army are support and basically all women in the army were (and still are) support.

The army winning the Arab-Israeli wars was a bastion of the new ‘Jewish masculinity’ and won wars by utilizing the eagerness of 18yo boys to prove their masculinity in the battlefields.

After feminism took hold women were forcefully inserted by laws into the most prestigious positions (fighter jet pilots, ship captains etc), but the hard grueling work of the infantry dogs, which is by far the most needed combat position, is done by men. Don’t expect for a feminist quota for body bags. The body bags still consist very mainly of dead 18yo males. While the IDF did not reach the ridiculousness of the American army just yet (women marines, etc.), is still a far cry from what it used to be. See the last few wars, the failure to win the last Lebanon war. The ruthless killing machine protecting Israel is getting softer and weaker every day.

The IDF is getting weaker and weaker since the IDF ability to confer masculinity was reduced by introducing women into the most prestigious combat roles. The relation between **service and masculinity was systematically eliminated** by the feminists and the IDF, as an institution, will very probably follow the US Armed Forces.

For the long run, the feminist dismantling of male institutions might yield unexpected consequences. If there are no state institutions to confer masculinity to young boys, boys just might discover a way to be masculine on their own (thugs culture, PUA culture, Emo culture? etc.) outside of the state funded establishment. Masculinity is innately intertwined with power and social status, and if boys cannot realistically achieve social status within the institutions of the state, they will make their own institution, their own gang and redefine the status structure so that they are on top once more. In the end, for the first time in history, **masculinity might be completely disconnected from the state and its institutions.**

As a man, this new situation mainly suggests that reliance on state institutions to achieve masculine social status is ill-advised. While it is preferable to have such support, for example a prestigious employment, your dominance must come from within you, not by your relation to the state or society, since the men’s relation and status in modern society is consistently undermined by feminism. In PUA terms, you must master the deep inner game. This might be a silver lining, in a way, for the individual man who can achieve this since it gives you independence. As a patriarch you must master the inner game and control of the frame to achieve inner-based social dominance, to stand strong in your resolve, even if things around you fall down, and it will fall down for many men.

Taking a broader point of view, states need to be able to forcefully deal with other states. And a state losing its ability to confer masculinity loses control of the amazing ability to violence and self endangerment contained within the restless testosterone infused blood of young men. This might be the reason of the inability of western states to decisively win wars against Muslim forces with much less funding and technical abilities. The state losing control over masculinity might also lead to the rage of young men lashing out (e.g. London riots).

(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the [Guide for a Young Patriarch](#) which is

based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)

The Meaning of Game

dicipres · 7 August 2012 · Archived copy · Original

PUA and game are commonly viewed as shallow and nihilistic, even by many of our own MRM supporters. Understanding and practicing game is also viewed as outright immoral by 'normal' (e.g. blue pill) people. However, game is basically about understanding sexuality and relationships. We in the androsphere\manosphere must introduce game to as many young men as possible:

Reason 1. Bringing game to young men is giving them power. Understanding game is about understanding human reproduction. **Everything Humans do and Feel Begins and Ends in Reproduction.** Giving young men game will give them better understanding and awareness of the world they face and thus a better ability to exploit it to their benefit.

Reason 2. In order to truly understand and practice game, you must eliminate your morals and the shame for not being 'normal' anymore. Today, since the social contracts are broken, morals are for the brainwashed slaves. I am not saying that men shouldn't feel empathy to a specific person, but men shouldn't care about society as a whole anymore. We owe them nothing. **Morals are for Blue Pill men and Morals Kill Free Thinking.** Be moral only **within a gang** of your own, western society is not our to protect anymore. It belongs to the majority of voters, and it is not us.

Nobody really care about the young men growing today. At best, the government/MSM just want men not to make trouble and to be beneficial to majority of voters (i.e. women). The fatherless generation needs guidance from someone who truly cares about them and truly understand the anger they have and the lies they have been told.

Over believing in evolution

dicipres · 22 August 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Recently I was in a conference involving a talk about bio-mimetic design, which is essentially utilizing nature inspired ideas for engineering applications.

One of the lecturers mentioned three interesting points, which may be relevant to some of recent discussion in the androsphere (see [Heartiste's post about female athletes becoming male-like...](#)):

1. It is common for bio-mimetic engineers (and almost everyone else) to believe that nature design is “optimal” (e.g. a fish shape is optimal for swimming in water), while it might be optimal, it never optimal with regard to a single parameter, but a wide array of parameters and biological limitations acting on the organism.
2. Many species are still significantly evolving and hadn't reached the optimal configuration yet.
3. Even when species reaches some kind of stable optimum (e.g. sharks) there is no guarantee it is a global optimum, only a local one (look for global and local maxima if you don't get this point).

In conclusion, while the evolution point-of-view (and specifically evolutionary psychology) indeed can be used to understand our world, and is a powerful weapon for fighting equality/individualism/morality dictated by progressives, it has limitations.

With regard to the discussion in the androsphere on female athletes becoming male-like, my view is that both men and women are optimized to running, fighting, etc... however for men this parameter is more significant compared to women, and thus their bodies are adapted accordingly. Since the best female athletes represent an optimization for strength/speed/etc, their optimization is more like men and they thus are more manly.

Religion makes you Beta

dicipres · 28 August 2012 · Archived copy · Original

There is an interesting paper published in *Evolution & Human Behavior* on the effects of religion on men and women. The paper is entitled “Religious cognition down-regulates sexually selected, characteristically male behaviors in men, but not in women” and was written by Michael E. McCullough, Evan C. Carter, C. Nathan DeWall, Carolina M. Corrales.

Abstract: “Men are typically stronger, riskier, “showier,” and more impulsive than women. According to sexual selection theory, such behaviors may have enhanced reproductive fitness for ancestral human males. However, such behaviors are facultative, and the mechanisms that cause them respond to social and environmental cues that indicate whether outlays of strength, risk-taking, showing off, or impulsivity are likely to lead to payoffs in any given instance. Recent research based on the Reproductive Religiosity Model suggests that, in contemporary Western societies, religious beliefs and institutions are differentially espoused and promulgated by restricted sexual strategists (whose reproductive strategies focus on high fertility, monogamy, and high parental care) to limit the exercise of unrestricted sexuality, which threatens the viability of restricted sexual strategies (e.g., by reducing paternity certainty and male parental investment). On this basis, we hypothesized that experimental manipulations of religious cognition would reduce men’s impulsivity and motivation to demonstrate their physical prowess. Supporting this hypothesis, three experiments revealed that priming participants with religious concepts (i.e., participants wrote essays about religion, read an essay supporting the existence of an afterlife, or were implicitly exposed to religious words) reduced men’s (but not women’s) impulsivity with money and their physical endurance on a hand grip task. The primes affected men’s behaviors irrespectively of men’s scores on a self-report measure of religious commitment.”

Well, it might hurt the feelings of some good men, but it seems that religion reduces men’s “physical endurance on a hand grip task” and in general make men less masculine. From the manosphere perspective, the evidence suggests that religion acts to betazied the male population and control men’s sexuality. In the past, religions also limited women’s sexuality and increased paternal certainty, thus making this a reasonable contract. In the present, since the social contracts are broken (even for the religious) it is against the self interest of men to remain religious. Slut is the default mode of the western woman. Sluts go for alphas. Hedonistic behavior (i.e. follow your heart bs...) will always lead women to alphas. Since religion enforce betazation of men under the current cultural climate it makes no sense for men to be religious.

Encouraging data from PEW research center

dicipres · 18 September 2012 · Archived copy · Original

From **Pew Research Center – A recovery no better than the recession**

“The median income of American households decreased by as much in the two years after the official end of the Great Recession as it did during the recession itself. The latest estimates from the Census Bureau show that the median income for U.S. households in 2011 was \$50,054. In 2009, the year the Great Recession ended, the median income of U.S. households had been \$52,195 (in 2011 dollars). Thus, in the two years since the end of the recession, median household income has fallen by 4.1%.

The decrease in household income from 2009 to 2011 almost exactly equaled the decrease in income in the two years of the recession. During the Great Recession, the median U.S. household income (in 2011 dollars) dropped from \$54,489 in 2007 to \$52,195 in 2009, a loss of 4.2%. By this yardstick, the recovery from the Great Recession is bypassing the nation’s households.”

and from **Pew Research Center – A third of Americans now say they are in the lower classes**

“The percentage of Americans who say they are in the lower-middle or lower class has risen from a quarter of the adult population to about a third in the past four years, according to a national survey of 2,508 adults by the Pew Research Center.

Not only has the lower class grown, but its demographic profile also has shifted. People younger than 30 are disproportionately swelling the ranks of the self-defined lower classes. The shares of Hispanics and whites who place themselves in the lower class also are growing.”

Several comments

- This is not “encouraging data” (unless you hate the US), the title is sarcastic.
- Doomsday predictions aside, the world seems to be changing rapidly and fundamentally before our eyes. Demographics, financial power and political power are changing along racial, religious and gender lines in an amazing rate. America’s power is declining. The nuclear family seems to be a relic of the past. More and more men do not have enough prestige to be attractive to women and are relying more and more on swagger. These are strange new times and young men need guidance and help more than ever to have power over their surroundings and their life. The lies ooze from the TV, music and movies.

(BTW, I significantly slowed the rate of posts lately and it going to stay this way. I’m currently entering a new professional phase in my life and I had to suspend work on the ‘Guide for a young Patriarch.’ When I’ll have time to continue the work on the guide, it will be the focus of my free time, not this blog.)

Lies, not mentioning, concealed ovulation, and cuckolding

dicipres · 26 September 2012 · Archived copy · Original

From [Wikipedia](#)

*“**Concealed ovulation** or **hidden estrus** is the lack of distinctive signaling that the adult female of a species is “in heat” and near **ovulation**. These signals may include swelling and redness of the genitalia in **baboons** and bonobos **Pan paniscus**, **pheromone** release in the feline family, etc. By comparison, the females of **humans** and a few other species^[1] have few external signs of **fecundity**, making it difficult to consciously deduct, by means of external signs only, whether or not a female is near ovulation.*”

From the Journal of **Biology Letters**: title “Women’s preference for dominant male odour: effects of menstrual cycle and relationship status” by Jan Havlicek, S. Craig Roberts and Jaroslav Flegr”

Abstract: *“Body odour may provide significant cues about a potential sexual partner’s genetic quality, reproductive status and health. In animals, a key trait in a female’s choice of sexual partner is male dominance but, to date, this has not been examined in humans. Here, we show that women in the fertile phase of their cycle prefer body odour of males who score high on a questionnaire-based dominance scale (international personality items pool). In accordance with the theory of mixed mating strategies, this preference varies with relationship status, being much stronger in fertile women in stable relationships than in fertile single women.”*

Think about it for a moment. **Concealed ovulation** means that women, the females of our species, are of the few that have evolved to eliminate signals of their ovulation, i.e. hide information. **Mixed mating strategies** means that women in relationships have natural tendency to cuckold their partners (and thus higher attraction to dominant men compared to single women), i.e. deceit. Hiding information and deceit are part of the biological imperative of women. It is also interesting that ovulation is hidden from the women themselves, which might be related to why most women don’t seem to be able to gauge their sexuality and sexual choices.

It is a sad thing to say, but women are seemed to be made to hide information and lie. This is why what women say, with regard to sexuality, shouldn’t be taken into account, only observations of their behavior. With the sexual liberation and ongoing collapse of society sexual regulations and morals, we will see more of women’s dark side in action, and a harder time for maintaining marriage-worthy relationships (BTW, I’m sure that similar analysis of men will show a very dark side to men’s sexuality as well). In general, as a patriarch you must **understand women, including their darker sides, even better than they understand themselves and be careful with your trust.**

*(For the new reader, here is a link to the latest draft (pdf, 14/Jun/2012) of the **Guide for a Young Patriarch** which is based on the posts made in this blog and attempts to organize them into a consistent message.)*

Feminism Cannot Prevail in an Environment Which Includes Significant Number of Masculine Men

dicipres · 22 October 2012 · Archived copy · Original

I will use **logical arguments** where each step is reduced to two premises and a conclusion or a lemma (a lemma is defined as a contention for premises as well as a premise for a contention above it.)

Premise 1: Masculinity is Related to Testosterone.

Support to premise 1: A female fetus will **develop male physical and behavioral traits** if the fetus experiences high level of testosterone during pregnancy.

Premise 2: Dominance Creates Testosterone and Testosterone Creates Dominance.

Support to premise 1: See the article in **Fake it Till You Make It**: “In “Power Posing: Brief Nonverbal Displays Affect Neuroendocrine Levels and Risk Tolerance”, Cuddy shows that simply holding one’s body in expansive, “high-power” poses for as little as two minutes stimulates higher levels of testosterone (the hormone linked to power and dominance in the animal and human worlds).” See also **“Status, testosterone and human intellectual performance”** on the link between dominance and testosterone.

Lemma 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Masculinity Requires Dominance.

Support to Lemma 1: since dominance and testosterone are interchangeable, and since masculinity is emanates from testosterone, masculinity requires dominance.

Premise 3, Feminism Acts to Eliminate the Dominance of Males.

Support to premise 3: see **Feminist Social and Political Thought**: e.g. “To eliminate men dominance on social orders, women must focus on women Radical Protests “

Contention 1, based on Lemma 1 and Premise 3: Feminism Cannot Prevail in an Environment which Includes Significant Number of Masculine Men.

Support to contention 1: Masculine men would attempt to dominate their surroundings and refuse being dominated since it is the essence of their masculinity (see Lemma 1), in contradiction to the feminist requirement of lack of male dominance in society (see Premise 3).

Interesting papers from the new volume of Evolution and Human Behavior

dicipres · 4 November 2012 · Archived copy · Original

- **2D:4D ratios predict hand grip strength (but not hand grip endurance) in men (but not in women)** (From Evolution & Human Behavior, Volume 33, Issue 6 , Pages 780-789, November 2012, by Liana S.E. Hone & Michael E. McCullough).

A single sentence on this article: **more (somewhat limited) evidence that 2D:4D correlates to masculinity.**

Abstract: *"In humans, the ratio of the second digit to the fourth digit — the 2D:4D ratio — is a sexually dimorphic trait (men, on average, exhibit lower 2D:4D ratios than do women) that is influenced by prenatal testosterone exposure, but not by circulating testosterone levels in adulthood. Consequently, 2D:4D ratios are commonly used as indirect measures of prenatal testosterone exposure. Many studies have examined the associations of 2D:4D ratios with sexually dimorphic adaptations that are thought to be influenced by such exposure, including physical prowess. The existing literature, however, remains unclear as to (1) whether 2D:4D ratios are more closely linked to strength or to endurance; and (2) whether 2D:4D ratios are linked with physical prowess for both men and women. In 100 men and 122 women, the relationship of 2D:4D ratios with maximum voluntary contraction (MVC) scores (hand grip strength) and maximum endurance time (MET) scores (local muscular endurance) using a hand dynamometer was examined. Controlling for age, height, weight, and average digit length, we found that 2D:4D ratios significantly predicted MVC scores in men, but not in women. 2D:4D ratios did not significantly predict MET scores for either sex. These results suggest that prenatal testosterone exposure in this sample is significantly related to hand grip strength in men, but not in women (and to local muscular endurance in neither sex), and, therefore, that strength, rather than local muscular endurance, potentially drives the relationship between 2D:4D ratios and physical prowess."*

- **Children and marital satisfaction in a non-Western sample: having more children increases marital satisfaction among the Igbo people of Nigeria** (From Evolution & Human Behavior, Volume 33, Issue 6 , Pages 771-774, November 2012, by Ernest I. Onyishi, Piotr Sorokowski, Agnieszka Sorokowska, R. Nathan Pipitone)

A single sentence on this article: **We may think Africa is poor and in trouble, and it is true in some ways, but they still reproduce more than the west (which makes them more biologically successful in a way) and enjoy their children more than they enjoy their cellphones/emails/reality TV...**

Abstract: *"Previous research has demonstrated that having more children decreases marital satisfaction among parents. However, the universality of these findings is limited since the vast majority of the studies have been conducted in Western countries. In the present study, 374 people from the Igbo ethnic group (Nigeria) were assessed for levels of marital satisfaction and the number of children. In contrast to almost all previous findings, we found a positive relationship between the number of children and marital satisfaction among parents. Number of children was the strongest predictor of marital satisfaction even when compared to other variables like wealth and education. Our results suggest that the negative relationship between the number of children and marital satisfaction is not culturally universal and probably only characterizes developed, individualistic Western countries. We discuss our findings from a sociocultural and evolutionary perspective."*

- **Cues to fertility: perceived attractiveness and facial shape predict reproductive success** (From Evolution & Human Behavior, Volume 33, Issue 6 , Pages 708-714, November 2012, by Lena S. Pflüger, Elisabeth Oberzaucher, Stanislav Katina, Iris J. Holzleitner, Karl Grammer)

A single sentence on this article: **Feminine women with symmetric faces have more children than ugly fat cows (in rural places, not in the developed west).**

Abstract: *"Attractive facial features in women are assumed to signal fertility, but whether facial attractiveness predicts*

reproductive success in women is still a matter of debate. We investigated the association between facial attractiveness at young adulthood and reproductive life history—number of children and pregnancies—in women of a rural community. For the analysis of reproductive success, we divided the sample into women who used contraceptives and women who did not. Introducing two-dimensional geometric morphometric methodology, we analysed which specific characteristics in facial shape drive the assessment of attractiveness and covary with lifetime reproductive success. A set of 93 (semi)landmarks was digitized as two-dimensional coordinates in postmenopausal faces. We calculated the degree of fluctuating asymmetry and regressed facial shape on facial attractiveness at youth and reproductive success. Among women who never used hormonal contraceptives, we found attractive women to have more biological offspring than less attractive women. These findings are not affected by sociodemographic variables. Postmenopausal faces corresponding to high reproductive success show more feminine features—facial characteristics previously assumed to be honest cues to fertility. Our findings support the notion that facial attractiveness at the age of mate choice predicts reproductive success and that facial attractiveness is based on facial characteristics, which seem to remain stable until postmenopausal age.”

- **The role of body fat in female attractiveness** (From Evolution & Human Behavior Volume 33, Issue 6 , Pages 672-681, November 2012, by Mark D. Faries, John B. Bartholomew)

A single sentence on this article: **Waist-to-hip ratio, which is an indicator of female attractiveness, is distorted by body fat, i.e. fat women are unattractive regardless of their waist to hip ratio.**

Abstract: “The purpose of the present study was to investigate the role of body fat percentage (BF%) on female attractiveness. To this end, a series of female body images were selected from a collection of dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry scans. Images were stratified by three levels (low, mid, and high) of waist-to-hip ratio (WHR) and seven levels (15%–50%) of BF%. These 21 images were presented in a random order and rated for attractiveness. Results indicate that WHR, BMI, and BF% are all significant predictors of female attractiveness when regressed separately ($R^2=0.19$, 0.70 , and 0.76 , respectively). When regressed simultaneously, all three variables accounted for 87% of the variance in image attractiveness, with only BF% and WHR being significant predictors. Further analysis revealed that body fat might disrupt the negative linear relationship between WHR and attractiveness. Men and women differed significantly in most categories of WHR and BF%, with men generally rating images as less attractive than women. These data indicate that BF% appears to be a strong cue for attractiveness and that the impact of WHR and BMI on attractiveness is dependent, in part, on BF%. The appearance of body fat may provide disruption in the visual cues of both shape and size of the female body, potentially impacting behavior.”

- **Testosterone levels correlate with the number of children in human males, but the direction of the relationship depends on paternal education** (From Evolution & Human Behavior, Volume 33, Issue 6 , Pages 665-671, November 2012 by Grazyna Jasienska, Michal Jasienski, Peter T. Ellison)

Two sentences on this article: **High testosterone makes you more likely to impregnate women and have more children but being a father reduces your testosterone. Education makes one mechanism more important than the other.**

Abstract: “Most research shows that fatherhood is related to reduced testosterone (T) levels, but relationships between the number of children and T levels are not addressed. In humans, paternal care usually involves obtaining adequate resources to support children, which may require engaging in male–male competition and maintaining high T levels. We hypothesize that T levels in fathers should increase with increasing family size. In 78 Polish men, aged 30 to 77 years, the number of children was significantly correlated with paternal T levels, but the direction of this relationship was dependent on the fathers’ education. In agreement with our hypothesis, in men with below-college education, T levels increased with increasing number of children. In contrast, in men with college education, the number of children was negatively related to paternal T levels. Drop in T levels throughout the day tended to be less pronounced the more children fathers had, irrespective of their educational level. Our results suggest that a hypothesis of simple trade-offs between mating and parenting effort may be too simplistic to explain changes in testosterone response to parenting in human males. In order to understand functional response of changes in T levels, it is crucial to account for family size

and socioeconomic factors. However, due to the cross-sectional study design, we cannot exclude the possibility that T levels influenced reproductive behavior (rather than vice versa) and thus the number of children produced by men.”

- **Childlessness drives the sex difference in the association between income and reproductive success of modern Europeans** (From Evolution & Human Behavior, Volume 33, Issue 6 , Pages 628-638, November 2012, by Julia A. Barthold, Mikko Myrskylä, Owen R. Jones)

Three sentences on this article: **Women with low income are less likely to have children than high income women, while the inverse is true for men (high income men have more children than low income men). Gender dimorphism with regard to status and income seems to increase, not decrease, in feminist-controlled countries. Social engineering seems to be backfiring... maybe our future sons will enjoy feminine family-oriented women instead of the lawycercunt-don't know to cook-slut-BShD-feminist-modern-woman.**

Abstract: “The association between reproductive success and income in economically developed societies remains a controversial and understudied topic. The commonly made statement that individuals with a higher income have fewer children defies evolutionary explanation. Here we present results from an analyses of the association between lifetime reproductive success (LRS) and income for modern Europeans from 13 countries. We examine the relationships among income, partner income, sex and LRS, and the role of childlessness in driving the relationships. For women, we find a negative association between LRS and income, while for men, we find a flat or slightly positive one. The sex difference in the association appears to be driven by income’s sex-specific association with childlessness; men with a low income have a relatively high risk of childlessness, while women with a low income have a low risk of childlessness. Consequently, once childless people are excluded from the analysis, LRS is negatively associated with income for both sexes. We argue that the observed LRS–income associations may be an outcome of evolved behavioural predispositions operating in modern environments and conclude that, even though humans fail to maximise LRS at all income levels in modern settings, evolutionary theory can still help to explain sex differences in LRS.”

Also

Announcement, As maybe some of you know, I am writing this blog with the intention of collecting the ideas presented here into a book, which will be entitled ‘A Guide for a Young Patriarch’. There is already a **rough draft** of the book. However, in recent weeks, I decided to dump the current draft and rewrite it anew. So the book will take more time to be ready...

Wide Gender Gap on Importance of Abortion as Election Issue (From PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE & THE PRESS)

“Women are far more likely than men to rate several issues as very important to their vote in the presidential election this year, including abortion and health care.

Among registered voters, more than half of women (54%) say the issue of abortion will be very important in their voting decision, compared with 36% of men — a difference of 18 percentage points. Among all registered voters, 46% say the issue of abortion will be very important to their vote.

While 81% of women voters say health care will be very important, fewer men (67%) view that issue as very important. Women also are more likely than men to view education (by 10 points) and jobs (eight points) as very important. There are no issues that significantly more men than women rate as very important”

On Tribalism

dicipres · 20 November 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Humans have a tendency for tribalism (defined here as emotional identification with a group of people). This tendency must have evolutionary reasons which may or may not be relevant today (e.g. being a sport fan clearly involves tribalism, yet don't seem to give any reproductive advantage). In any case, it is striking how the most liberal anti-racism people tend to have the most tribal view point of the world. Equality advocacy today cannot exist without tribalism since it is based on the demand for 'fairness' between different sub-groups of people and thus requires the classification into race, gender and religion of each individual within society. (I wonder how similar is the extreme case of the Nazi race classification scheme to the race and gender classification made in the modern university diversity centers.)

It is pretty clear, even without the analysis below, that if a tribe is created within a society, the people outside of the tribe are in disadvantage and will thus tend to create a tribe of their own. The liberals hate tribalism, but are in fact the biggest promoter of tribalism.

For example:

- If liberals didn't have a tribal view-point of the world, they wouldn't care about the so called "difference" in pay between men and women, just the average pay.
- If liberals didn't have a tribal view-point of the world, they wouldn't care about the so called "difference" in academic achievement between different groups, just having the most efficient educational system.
- If liberals didn't have a tribal view point of the world, they would just care that companies have the best CEOs without regard to gender.
- Similarly, why care about men getting less custody than women? If you care about society you should only care about giving custody to the better parent, the men/women statistics should be irrelevant.

If one wants to improve society, efficiency and sustainability are to be improved, and the members contributing the most should be rewarded for contributing and reproduce more, not the weakest members which are burden on society (e.g. traditional families pay to subsidize irresponsible single mothers). Equality-politics is not good for society as a whole. Equality politics is a tribal game, it is waste of resources for the entire society, and only good to rearrange the power within a weaker society to benefit sub tribes.

It is also interesting to ask if tribe team-women and the emerging tribe team-men are biologically sane, or like a fan spending money on his sport group, a biologically insane waste of resources. Tribes are basically fighting for reproduction, while men and women are reproductively equal by definition (every child is a reproductive success of a man and a woman). This might be changed by technology, for example making babies from two eggs without sperm will change this reproductive equality and might lead to true reproductive conflict... until then the gender war is reproductively meaningless.

BTW, here is some very initial very crude analysis on this subject, to be continued... and comments and suggestions would be welcomed.

Premise 1: All genes seek reproduction.

Premise 2: Our behavior is an expression of our genes (even environmental-based behaviors are learned utilizing our genetically determined brain).

Lemma 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Human behavior facilitates (or facilitated in the past) reproduction.

Definition 1: We define tribe 1 as a group of N1 people (where the biggest possible tribe includes all humans).

Lemma 2, based on definition 1 and premise 2: **On average, being part of tribe increases the reproductive success of an individual.**

Corollary to lemma 2: **An average individual of the tribe increases the reproductive success of the rest of the tribe.**

Definition 2: **Tribe 2 is a subgroup of tribe 1, defined as a group of N_2 people, smaller than N_1 , the total number of people in tribe 1.**

Definition 3: **An average individual increases the reproductive success of the rest of the tribe by A (defined as additional children raised).**

Lemma 3: **A member of tribe 1 have additional reproductive success of $N_1 * A / N_1 = A$ if there are no sub tribes to tribe 1. i.e. each member gets as much as the average member gives.**

Lemma 4: **If a sub tribe 2 is created within tribe 1, members of the sub tribe can have additional reproductive success of $(N_1 - N_2) * A / N_1 + N_2 * A / N_2$, while members of tribe 1 who are not members of the sub group is just $(N_1 - N_2) * A / N_1$.**

Are Feminism and MRM Biologically Sane?

dicipres · 6 December 2012 · Archived copy · Original

Previously, I wrote about the idea of **biological insanity**, which is essentially stating that all actions made by any living being emanate from a genetic imperative for reproduction and that rapid changes to our society, combined with slow changes to our genes, yielded insane directions given to us (in the form of feelings) by our body. As an example: a man paying a prostitute is acting on his genetic imperative to reproduce, however, the use of modern contraceptives eliminates the possibility of reproduction and the man's actions are, in modern society, biologically insane, i.e. detrimental to reproduction due to loss of resources.

My **last post was on tribalism**, and its possible benefits for reproduction of the sub group (while possibly detrimental to the entire human group). Looking at feminists and MRAs we can clearly see tribalism-like actions. The same mechanism designed to create cohesion of groups in order to improve the genetic success of the group is used to motivate women and men into feminism and the MRM.

However, assuming we ignore technological possibilities for same gender reproduction, any child born has the genes of a man and a woman and every child born has about 50% chance to carry the Y-chromosome, the genetic definition of men. Hence, feminism does not increase the reproductive success of women over men and MRM does not increase the reproductive success of men over women. **In reproductive success, which is in the core of all human activities, men and women are equal by definition.**

Hence, it is genetically sane to look on the sustainability and efficiency of all of society, not the male tribe or the female tribe, since there are no male or female tribes. Resist feminism because its ideology hurts society, not because of gender tribalism.

Feminism isn't at the point of wanting to actually eliminate the male genome. A true gender war can only occur after technology refines male only (very difficult to create) or female only reproduction (easy to create) where the Y-chromosome will actually need to fight for its survival.

The Game of Malcolm X

dicipres · 29 December 2012 · Archived copy · Original

I recently read “The Autobiography of Malcolm X, as told to Alex Haley.” Malcolm X is a very troubling person to hear. He is very total in his racial view of the world. Every action he makes and every observation he makes are related to his race. He is never just a person, he is always a black person. It becomes tiring to read at some point.

He does have some interesting comments on women and he is an ultimate natural alpha.

White women also appear to assist him, as an alpha, in his war against white men, which he generally describes as betas. As a young man of the age of 17, he describes how he would make a beautiful white stay-at-home woman he called ‘Sophia’ give him money every time she meets him (a money that her white beta husband gave her). Imagine that, a woman gives a 17 yo boy, money after sex, while he beats her and use her for his crimes (which eventually get her and her sister arrested and reveals her adultery to her family).

Some relevant quotes:

“A woman should occasionally be babied enough to show her the man had affection, but beyond that she should be treated firmly.”

“Our young girls, our daughters, and our baby sisters are becoming unwed mothers before they are hardly out of their teens. Our community has 1000’s of unwed mothers, that has no hope of ever getting a husband. Our community has 10’s of 1000’s of little black babies who have no father to act as their provider—”

“As a young minister I wouldn’t have considered it possible for me to love any woman. I had too much experience that women were only tricky, deceitful, untrustworthy flesh.”

The Self and the Red Pill

dicipres · 4 January 2013 · Archived copy · Original

The manospherian nerds quantified, acronymed and cataloged human behavior in a non-academic and open manner for the masses, while using many academic works. The lies behind our culture became visible. Troubling phenomenon such as that selfless behavior of a man toward a woman will in many cases yield cuckoldry and resentment while the selfish and exploitative behavior will commonly yields women's adoration is revealed. The hard statistical truth about the failure rates of modern families and the consequences to many men in such circumstances is revealed and discussed. Reality is not what is seen through our culture stories.

However, specifically, the study of game and the evolutionary and biological analysis of human behavior allows to analyse human behavior and relate it to chemical, biological and evolutionary mechanisms. We can relate neuromodulators such as Oxytocin to long term relationships and dopamine to addiction and desire to short term experiences. We know that certain geometrical properties of women (e.g. symmetry, smooth skin) trigger attraction repeatedly and predictability within healthy men (among other mechanisms). We know and can predict that dominance and status will trigger attraction within healthy women (among other mechanisms) and can have a reasonable assessment of the evolutionary reasons to this attraction. We can better understand our world and the real, selfish, motives behind human relationships, sex and love.

In essence, the red pill shows us that our feelings are regulated by our genes and can be predicted since genes act to reproduce themselves. Our feelings are just a part of a biological machine aimed at reproduction. Issac Asimov often wrote about robots behaving like humans, developing consciousnesses, becoming robots with emotions, becoming human. However, the red pill shows us that **human are the robots**. A robot would send a current to create action in an actuator, and our feelings are modified by our genes to create action in us, we are just a biological machine.

Since feelings are just a tool to control us, our feelings are not us. What are we? Descartes said 'I think therefore I am.' Perhaps humans are not robots with feelings, but robots with ideas.

It is ironic that as science learns more about our emotions and shows them to be 'mechanical'-like and shows the ease in which emotions can be chemically changed, our modern culture adores and worship emotions like not civilization ever did. The ultimate human accomplishment today is to be happiness. Every possible decadent behavior is justified if it makes one happy. Perhaps emotions are adored due to the dominance of women in modern culture and the higher importance women give to emotions compared with men ([see paper](#)).


Roosh recently had a post which suggested [deciding what you want and then reframing it so that you'll be happy with it](#). Basically Roosh suggested controlling your emotions, not be controlled by them. When you really think about what is said here, it is not short of a revolution.

Read More Hemingway

dicipres · 14 January 2013 · Archived copy · Original

Ernest Hemingway is a great writer, and specifically a great writer on masculinity. Personally I treat the 'old man and the sea' (focused on death, fatherhood, honor and professionalism) as a nearly religious text and read it over 20 times. Not all of his works are of equal worth, and very often he writes about defective incomplete men. However, he has a deep knowledge on men and the sexuality of women and when he writes about the behavior of a complete man, much is to be learned (although he seem not to know or care about the maternal part of women).

This is a page from 'The Fifth Column,' showing a great example of amused mastery, which I'm sure Heartiste, Roosh and Rollo would approve.



The description of Philip's behavior is amazing, in very little words much is said. Philip's behavior radiates a clear message: to Dorothy 'You are not my equal, I like you but I am your superior' (also note the semi-shit-test 'sit here' which he takes as a joke). The attraction of women to dominant men and the evo/bio reasons to it are widely discussed in the manosphere (my take is [here](#) and [here](#)) and I'll not expand on it now, the simple result is the Dorothy's attraction for Philip is inevitable.

Hemingway's '[The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber](#)' is a harsh manospherian-like accusation against girl-power-type western women. In this story a Cuckold finds courage and becomes a man for a few hours before being killed by his girl-power wife since, while she likes to have sex with strong 'alpha' men on the side, a strong and uncontrollable husband terrifies her. To Hemingway, Francis' few hours as an unafraid man are worth more than his entire life as a whipped beta husband, and these few happy hours defined his life.

Dear young Patriarch, read more Hemingway.

Sluts and the Cohesion of Society

dicipres · 5 February 2013 · Archived copy · Original

There are many different, sometime exotic and bizarre, animal mating behaviors. Taking data from animal mating research and applying it to humans should always be done in caution. However, this study “**Faithful females key to evolution of bird societies**,” contains some interesting analysis of promiscuity that seems beneficial as a tool to understand what the feminist and sexual revolutions did to the human society and the end of family in the west.

Relevant quote:

“We found that across bird species, whether or not a species is cooperative depends upon the sex lives of females,” says Dr Ashleigh Griffin of the Department of Zoology at Oxford University, who led the research. ‘The more promiscuous a female is – the more mates she has – the less help there is likely to be from the rest of the family in raising the young.’

She explains: ‘When females are faithful and mate with only a single male, her offspring will be full siblings and hence closely related to each other. This favours cooperation, because helping a close relative reproduce can be an efficient way of transmitting genes to the next generation. ‘In contrast, if a female is promiscuous and mates with multiple males, her offspring will be half siblings and so less related. In this case, young adult birds may be more likely to disperse to breed themselves, rather than stay on the nest to help mum.’

A world filled with empathy is a world filled with lies

dicipres · 7 February 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This is a part from the new draft of the 'guide for the young patriarch.' I deleted the older version of the guide and will publish here parts of the new version of the guide as I progress. The new version of the guide is written in a form based on informal logic.)

Premise 1: The validity of an argument or an opinion is determined by how accurately this opinion or argument correlates with reality.

Corollary 1 to premise 1: The validity of an argument is not related to the argument being offensive, sexist, racist or otherwise immoral.

Corollary 2 to premise 1: The validity of an argument is not related to emotional pain it causes to others or yourself.

Premise 2: Humans tend to avoid pain.

Contention 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Humans will tend avoid arguments creating pain to themselves or others people they feel empathy to.

Corollary 1 to Contention 1: A world filled with empathy is a world filled with lies.


Corollary 2 to Contention 1: The bad sees the world more clearly than the good.

Corollary 3 to Contention 1: In order to think clearly you must, at least temporarily, be able to eliminate your empathy to yourself and others.

Discussion: Understanding the analysis and ideas in this text will force you to let go completely of political correctness, the desire to not offend others, and to adhering to mainstream ideologues. In this text, truth is more important than feelings. It is better to be outside the box, where everything is open, every statement can be made, and deal with the other “bad” (or not) people here who are immoral. It is better to be free to think the even most horrible thoughts than to go back to the mental prison of politically correct insanity.

Remember Your Death

dicipres · 8 February 2013 · Archived copy · Original



We were given only ~30000 days to live. A time too short for sloth and avoiding pain.

The Problem of Emptiness

dicipres · 9 February 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This is a part from the new draft of the 'guide for the young patriarch.' I deleted the older version of the guide and will publish here parts of the new version of the guide as I progress. The new version of the guide is written in a form based on informal logic.)

Premise 1: Our genes seek to reproduce themselves.

Premise 2: Our emotions and desires are part of our biology, which is a manifestation of our genes.

Contention 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Our emotions and desires are a tool of our genes to facilitate reproduction of genetic data.

Corollary 1 to Contention 1: People who feel happiness and pleasure follow the instructions of their genes.

Corollary 2 to Contention 1: There is no great goal or meaning to our emotions. There is just emptiness.

Corollary 3 to Contention 1: Everything humans do and feel begin and end in reproduction.

Corollary 4 to contention 1: Love is just a tool of reproduction.

Corollary 5 to contention 1: There is no higher meaning (or any meaning for life).

Corollary 6 to contention 1: We exist due to reproduction and reproduction makes us exist.

Corollary 7 to contention 1: We and our 'souls' are just biological machines.

Corollary 8 to contention 1: The question, 'how can I get laid?' is the essential question of an organism.

Corollary 9 to contention 1: There is nothing true to be comforted by, only lies can comfort.

Corollary 10 to contention 1: Things like viewing death of an innocent person cause us much distress since they represent loss of genes.

Corollary 11 to contention 1: Not only there is no god, there is also no proof of innate value to human life.

Discussion: There is no higher goal to life and even the modern hedonism (i.e. do what makes you happy) is servitude, since our emotions are just a tool used by our genes to manipulate our behavior. Not only god is dead; love is dead too. Understanding of our world and ourselves comes at a great price which only lies can truly comfort.

Review of Jack Donovan's "The Way of Men"

dicipres · 22 February 2013 · Archived copy · Original

Jack Donovan is currently the most respectable face of the androsphere. Donovan's book "The way of Men" presents a model of masculinity based on analysis of the conditions humans faced during the vast majority of time in which humanity and men evolved. Thus, a large part of this book utilizes the basic assumption (widely used in the androsphere) that our genes significantly influence our behaviour and that there is an increasing disconnect between our genetic nature and how modern equality-morality nurture expects us to behave. I don't agree with everything Donovan says, specifically the suggested solutions to start the world, but Donovan's ideas and views are always very intelligent and interesting to read. "The Way of Men" is both a well needed summary of a significant part of the androsphere and extension into Donovan's concepts and definitions of the gang and manly virtues. The greatness of this book is in clear simplifying definitions of ideas such as good man vs being good at being a man and the bonobo masturbation society.

This book is not perfect, it has flaws, but it is the best book written on masculinity and a must read book for a man aspiring to be good at being a man.

On Widespread Biological Insanity in the Modern World

dicipres · 26 February 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This is a part from the new draft of the 'guide for the young patriarch.' I deleted the older version of the guide and will publish here parts of the new version of the guide as I progress. The new version of the guide is written in a form based on informal logic.)

Premise 1: Our genes seek to reproduce themselves.

Premise 2: Our biology, which is a manifestation of our genes, significantly influences our emotions and desires.

Lemma 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Our emotions and desires are a tool of our genes to control human behavior in order to facilitate reproduction of genetic data.

Premise 3: The time scale for significant genetic changes is, at least, several human generations, while our world changed rapidly and radically (contraceptives, culture, etc.) in less than one human life.

Contention 1, from lemma 1 and premise 3: Our genes, and thus our emotions, are not adapted to the modern world which yields behaviors which are counterproductive to the original reason for the emotion yielding the behavior.

Corollary 1 to contention 1: Humans do things which are insane from a biological perspective.

Discussion: This insanity is manifested in numerous actions made by modern humans. A simple example to this insanity is paying a prostitute to have sex with you and using a condom. The reason you want to have sex with the prostitute emanates from your genes which entice you to have sex with the prostitute by injecting chemicals to your brain. Your genes are designed to a world without contraceptives and 'think' that you will impregnate the prostitute and thus ensure the propagation of your genes. However, in reality the chances of impregnating the prostitute are zero, since you live in a world with contraceptives. You are futility wasting resources and making a biologically insane action. You can say that you don't care about your genes and pay to have sex with the prostitute... but basically you are still following genetic instructions given to you in the form of pleasure by your out-of-date genes. You say you don't care about your genes, but you are very much controlled by them. If you go against your genes, and consciously act to make rational biological decisions, your genes will have better chance of propagating, but you might be less 'happy' since your out-of-date genes will punish you by taking away pleasure.

On Men and Women (basics)

dicipres · 3 March 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This is a part from the new draft of the 'guide for the young patriarch.' I deleted the older version of the guide and will publish here parts of the new version of the guide as I progress. The new version of the guide is written in a form based on informal logic.)

Premise 1: All genes seek reproduction.

Premise 2: The reproductive systems of men and women are not identical.

Contention 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Differences in biology would yield differences in the set of behaviors between men and women to optimize reproductive success.

Premise 3: Men do not have certainty of paternity, women have.

Contention 2, based on premise 3 and premise 1: Men will be less devoted to their children compared with women.

Corollary 1 to Contention 2: Paternity testing for multiple generations, enough to influence evolution, will make men more devoted parents.

Premise 4: Sex is biologically cheap for men, compared with women (pregnancy and childbirth vs. sperm).

Contention 3, based on premise 4 and premise 1: Sex is a better biological deal for men compared with women.

Corollary 1 to Contention 3: Men will prioritize quantity of lovers (more good deals, sperm is cheap) while women will prioritize the quality of their lovers (get best deal for the high price paid for sex).

Corollary 2 to Contention 3: Since sex is a better deal for men, women can demand resources (provider to assist in raising the children), or demand the men to be more attractive (hypergamy) to compensate the gap in biological price paid for sex.

The Marriage Strike is Real

dicipres · 7 March 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is not related to the Guide, but might be of interest to some in the androsphere.)

A recent article from Pew Research Center ([link](#)) includes the following data:

“among never-married adults ages 30 to 50, men (27%) are more likely than women (8%) to say they do not want to marry.”

Think about it for a second, men of the age range 30-50 are more than **three** times, compared with women, likely to say they do not want to marry. This is a very significant difference which can be interpreted as a “marriage strike”. (The Pew Research paper seems to just glance over this huge discrepancy without any further comment.)

Policy makers increasingly protect and empower women in both marriage and divorce, which unavoidably requires, in many cases, taking power from men. A married man today, in VAWA land and most western countries, is a man who is one phone call away from being removed from his home and losing power over a large portion of his money and income for a very long period of time.

The “marriage strike” is very probably not really a group action by men, but single men acting according to their best interests. I really doubt even 1% of men are aware of the androsphere, however, men do seem to know marriage is becoming more and more a bad deal and are aware of the plight of the divorced fathers.

There are No Alpha Females or Beta Females

dicipres · 18 March 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is not related to the Guide, but might be of interest to some in the androsphere.)

An interesting ScienceDaily article “[The Maternal Effect: How Mother Deer Protect Their Future Kings](#)” nicely presents the concept of “alpha” male > female > “beta” male. (Here I define an alpha male as a male with high chances to reproduce and a beta male a male with low chances to reproduce.)

This also suggests that the concept of alpha female or beta female is somewhat flawed. If an “Alpha Female” did exist, she would have got the similar preferential treatment the “Alpha Male” got. While females do have status differences, their chances to reproduce are limited by their biology and supported by their access to sex. Hence, female variance in reproductive success is much smaller than males, and the difference between “alpha female” and “beta female” is much smaller than the difference between the “alpha male” and the “beta male”.

While we always need to be careful applying animal research to humans, the researcher notes in the article that “For those unconcerned about deer or elk, this research can be a reminder that similar research exists for humans.”

In conclusion, men’s value can soar high or crash down, according to their status, while women are safely in the middle.

Short Review of “As I Walk These Broken Roads,” by DMJ Aurini

dicipres · 24 March 2013 · Archived copy · Original

I just finished Aurini’s book “**As I Walk These Broken Roads**” in Kindle and, well, Aurini appears to be an outstanding fiction writer. The book is focused on a friendship between two men in a post third-world-war-type settings and is very well written. Initially I expected the book to be just a thin transport medium for Aurini’s prolific views and ideas, however, he made sure it is first a full and well written story on people.

While this is a great book, this is not the FULL Aurini philosophy book since many of the ideas and views present in Aurini’s clips are absent or shorten in this book. I do hope Aurini will write a pure philosophy book in the future, since my interests are not how good of a writer he is, but in the ideas he present.

In any case, it is a highly recommended reading. I enjoyed this book tremendously it is a must reading to any student of the red-pill.

Femininity is Masochistic, Masculinity is Sadistic

dicipres · 24 April 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This is a part from the new draft of the 'guide for the young patriarch.' I deleted the older version of the guide and will publish here parts of the new version of the guide as I progress. The new version of the guide is written in a form based on informal logic.)

Alternative title: Why you should be an asshole and treat women like crap

"I am afraid that women appreciate cruelty, downright cruelty, more than anything else. They have wonderfully primitive instincts. We have emancipated them, but they remain slaves looking for their masters all the same," Oscar Wilde.

Premise 1: All genes seek reproduction.

Premise 2: Our emotions are an expression of our genes.

Lemma 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Our emotions are constructed so as to facilitate reproduction of genetic material.

Premise 3: Sex is biologically cheap for men, compared with women (e.g. pregnancy, childbirth and breast-feeding vs. sperm).

Lemma 2 based on premise 3 and premise 1: Sex is a better biological deal for men compared with women.

Corollary 1 to Lemma 2: Men will prioritize quantity of lovers (more good deals, sperm is cheap) while women will prioritize the quality of their lovers (get best deal for the high price paid for sex).

Corollary 2 to Lemma 2: It is of more importance for women, compared with men, to acquire the male genetic data with the best possible chance of reproduction.

Premise 4: Men who dominated and exploited women reproduced better, compared with men that did not dominated and exploited women.

Contention 1, based on corollary 2 to lemma 2 and premise 4: Women will tend to be sexually attracted to men who exploit and dominate them.

Corollary 1 to Contention 1: Women are sexually repulsed from men they can exploit and dominate.

Corollary 2 to Contention 1: A woman in a power position over a man will tend to be sexually repulsed by him.

Corollary 3 to Contention 1: Women sexuality is fulfilled when she is weak within her relationship.

Current draft of the Guide for a Young Patriarch

dicipres · 26 April 2013 · Archived copy · Original

I attach here a link to pdf file of the current draft of the

Guide for a Young Patriarch.

The progress is very slow, due to personal lack of time and the way I chose to write the guide. Only about 20% of the original guide were revised so far, but I believe the quality and clarity is now much improved. I appreciate the comments made on this work as they helped to improve it.

Dici Pres

Self-Game and Personal Prayers

dicipres · 10 May 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

Premise 1: Religions are effective in controlling human emotions and behavior.

Premise 2: One of the principal tools used widely by religions is the prayer, which is required in virtually all religions (sometimes up to five times a day).

Contention 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Prayer is an effective tool to control emotions and behavior.

Corollary 1 to Contention 1: Personal, self-designed prayers (as well as other tools used by religions and states) can be used your advantage in order to control and change your emotions and behavior.

Westernized-Judaism, the Empty Shell

dicipres · 11 May 2013 · Archived copy · Original

Many of the liberal/feminist/humanists/socialists currently neutering the heritage of the west are Jews. Much more than their proportion in the population. However, if you think this is a Jewish conspiracy for the Jewish culture to rule the world... look at the above video.

The chickens are coming home to roost. The cultural, tribal and coming-of-age meaning of the Bar-Mitzva ceremony is reduced to a Sweet-Sixteen-type self-promotion Bonobo-Monkey public Masturbation. The kid probably don't even know what he did wrong (well, except the 'singing'). This is a spit in the face of the old traditions, a true defamation of the Jewish religion (yet I doubt that the ADL would have any comments to make), a deep rot.


Kid, if you are somehow reading this, I don't blame you. You are just a product of your environment. I blame your parents.

Logic Diagram of “Femininity is Masochistic, Masculinity is Sadistic”

dicipres · 16 May 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is based on the ‘Guide to the Young Patriarch.’ The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

A reader by the handle of Snoosh made a visual representation of the structure of the argument made in “Femininity is Masochistic, Masculinity is Sadistic.” The diagram clearly presents the ideas of that post and I attach it here for the benefit of the readers.



Concealed Ovulation and Why it is Hard to Understand Women's Sexual Choices

dicipres · 16 May 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

Preliminary note: Women's ovulation is concealed, i.e. there are no distinctive signals that a woman is near ovulation. Such concealed ovulation is highly uncommon in nature and characterizes only humans and a few other species. More information on concealed ovulation can be found in Gangestad & Thornhill (2008).

Premise 1: All genes seek reproduction.

Premise 2: Our biology is a manifestation of genetic data.

Lemma 1, based on Premise 1 and Premise 2: Human biology exists to maximize successful reproduction.

Premise 4: Women have concealed ovulation, i.e. their biology conceals information regarding their sexuality and fertility.

Contention 1 from Lemma 1 and Premise 4: Women reproduction success benefits from hiding information regarding their own sexuality.

Corollary 1 to Contention 1: If there is an evolutionary advantage for women to conceal their sexual nature it must have affected more than just the biology of concealed ovulation. Hence, women's psychology and behavior had evolutionary pressure to conceal sexual information.

Corollary 2 to Contention 1: Biology evolved so that women themselves are not aware of their own ovulation. Hence, lack of self-awareness of their own sexual nature gave women reproductive advantage. Therefore, women's psychology and behavior had evolutionary pressure to reduce women's awareness of their own sexuality (extensive support for this claim can be found in Chivers, et al. 2010).

Corollary 3 to Contention 1: Women's sexual mystery is a deliberate attempt by nature to obtain reproductive advantage.

Corollary 4 to Contention 1: Don't listen to women on the subject of female attraction. They don't understand it (unless they are red-pill).

Corollary 5 to Contention 1: Women can't teach their sons how to interact with women (unless they are red-pill).

Discussion: There are several theories to as why women choose to hide sexual information. These theories range from cuckolding technique, keeping the man close as much as possible, and other hypotheses. In any case, the existence of concealed ovulation strongly suggests hiding information from others and themselves yielded a reproductive advantage for women.

It is hard to understand women's sexual behavior for a reason: their biology and psychology deliberately don't want you (or her) to understand it, since such understanding will give you true power over a woman

References

Gangestad SW, Thornhill R. (2008) [Human oestrus](#) Proc Biol Sci. 275(1638):991-1000.

Chivers ML, Seto MC, Lalumière ML, Laan E, Grimbos (2010) "[Agreement of self-reported and genital measures of sexual arousal in men and women: a meta-analysis](#)," T. Arch Sex Behav. 39(1):5-56.

The Selfish Nature of Selflessness

dicipres · 7 June 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

Alternative title: People who care about other people are actually assholes, just less self-centered assholes

Premise 1: All genes seek reproduction.

Premise 2: Our emotions are an expression of our genes.

Lemma 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Our emotions facilitate reproduction of genetic data.

Premise 3: Humans share many genes.

Contention 1, based on Premise 3 and Lemma 1: Genes in person A can reproduce by helping the reproduction of person B (as long as the damage to the reproductive success to person A is low enough, e.g. person B is of the opposite gender and is not a competitor to reproduction).

Premise 4: The more similar the appearance of person A is to person B, the more similar are their genes.

Contention 2, based on Premise 4 and Contention 1: Humans will tend to be more compassionate toward people similar to themselves.

Corollary 1 to Contention 1: Compassion and empathy are, like all other emotions, selfish emotions from a genetic perspective.

Discussion: Acts of generosity and compassion are actually genetically selfish behavior. A person sees himself in another person. Genes identify similar genes and control human behavior so as to assist the survival of similar genetic data.

People usually judge behavior in terms of good and bad, moral and immoral. From red-pill perspective we see only attempts, rational or irrational, effective or ineffective, for genetic reproduction. It may leave a feeling of huge emptiness, a gaping abyss, but it is the nature of the red-pill. It is the emotional price you must pay for the ability to think outside of the genetically induced matrix of human emotions and social morality. To think outside of yourself.

On Tribalism

dicipres · 20 June 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

Comment: In this post tribalism is used in the most general way as a term to describe the tendency of humans to create and identify with a group. The size of the group can be a pair, family, town, race, country, etc. While tribalism is created by (and eventually creates) genetically similar groups, the interplay between tribalism and genetic homogeneity will not be discussed here.

Premise 1: All genes seek reproduction.

Premise 2: Our emotions are an expression of our genes.

Lemma 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Our emotions facilitate reproduction.

Premise 3: The average reproductive success for members of a group is greater than that of humans without a group (e.g. for population of 100 people, 50 collaborating as a group will reproduce more than the 50 non-collaborating).

Contention 1, based on Lemma 1 and Premise 3: Humans have an emotional tendency to desire to belong in a group.

Premise 4: Within a given group, sub-groups can be created. All groups can be seen as sub-groups of group humanity.

Corollary 1 to Premise 3: The average reproductive success for members of a sub-group is greater than that of members of the original group without affiliation to a sub-group (e.g. if the U.S. consists of 100 American citizens, and 50 of them are part of a sub-U.S. group, and thus give preferable treatment to each-other, they will have an advantage over the 50 who only identify with the U.S. group and give equal treatment to all U.S. group members.)

Contention 1, based on Corollary 1 to Premise 3 and Lemma 1: The people outside of the sub-group would tend to create a counter sub-group so as not to be in a disadvantage. Hence, creation of a sub-group creates a counter sub-group.

Corollary 1 to Contention 1: A group, or a sub-group, is defined by the people outside of the group (e.g. whiteness only has meaning if there are black people acting as a group and similarly blackness only has meaning near whites. The enclosed rich white people don't feel white, while the poor whites which are in contact with black groups have stronger white identification.)

Corollary 2 to Contention 1: Tribalism creates a rival and is created by a rival.

Premise 5: Division of a group to sub-groups weakens the group against external threats, and thus lowers the average reproductive success of the group members.

Contention 2 based on Premise 5 and Corollary 1 to Premise 3: Creating a sub-group within a group yields benefits over other group members but weakens the original group. Thus, a group will stay united if unity provides advantage over external threats which is more significant than the benefits a member might obtain by joining a sub-group.

Corollary 1 to Contention 2: A group (or a sub-group) cannot stay united without an external threat, interest or a rival group.

Corollary 2 to Contention 2: If one sub-group totally destroys the rival sub-group it will no longer be united (e.g. if there was a white vs black war and all black people were eliminated, there will be no more white identity, only sub-white-group identities such as French and English, etc., if Jews would somehow eliminate all gentiles, there will not be a Jewish identity, just spharadim and ashcenazim, etc.)

Self-Education of a Patriarch

dicipres · 6 July 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

The accumulation of knowledge and building of a solid inner-base for a patriarch is a consuming task of the utmost importance. Here I suggest texts, old texts when possible, as a tool to the self-education and building of the constitution of a patriarch. I read and benefited from every book suggested here.

War

The Art of War, *by Sun Tzu, ~500 B.C. China*

On War, *by Carl von Clausewitz, 1832 Prussia*

Mastery

The Book of Five Rings, *by Miyamoto Musashi, 1645 Japan.*

The Old Man and the Sea, *by Ernest Hemingway, 1952 Cuba*

Theory of Game

Attraction isn't a choice, *by David DeAngelo 2004 USA*

The Selfish Gene, *by Richard Dawkins, 1976 USA.*

Application of Game

Bang: More Lays In 60 Days, *by Roosh V 2007 USA.*

The Married Man Sex Life Primer, *by Athol Kay 2011 USA.*

This list will be extended in the future (GBFM/Free Northerner style). I will be happy to accept suggestions for other relevant books from blog readers. Specifically books that facilitate learning and self-growth (not necessarily the most entertaining books).

Some words on Roy Baumeister

dicipres · 30 July 2013 · Archived copy · Original

I recently read Roy Baumeister's book "Willpower: Rediscovering the Greatest Human Strength." This book is a practical guide to understand your willpower and how to manage and preserve it. It is basically science applied to help people in very simple and useful ways. Read it.

This book led me to read other works by Roy Baumeister and I now recommend reading basically everything ever written by Roy Baumeister. He wrote the somewhat anti-feminist book "*Is There Anything Good About Men?: How Cultures Flourish by Exploiting Men*" and studied female sexuality in his extremely interesting works on erotic plasticity (Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Gender Differences in Erotic Plasticity: The Female Sex Drive as Socially Flexible and Responsive. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(3), 347-374). All these subjects have relation to game, self-improvement and anti-feminism and are of interest to many young men and to the manosphere.

Roy Baumeister is a very unexpected to red-pill/manosphere ally in the academic world.

On Racism

dicipres · 31 July 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

Premise 1: All genes seek reproduction.

Premise 2: Our emotions are an expression of our genes.

Lemma 1, based on premise 1 and premise 2: Our emotions facilitate reproduction of genetic data.

Premise 3: Humans share many genes.

Contention 1, based on Premise 3 and Lemma 1: Genes in person A can reproduce by helping the reproduction of person B (as long as the damage to the reproductive success to person A is low enough).

Premise 4: The more similar the appearance of person A is to person B, the more similar are their genes.

Contention 2, based on Premise 4 and Contention 1: Humans will tend to be more empathic toward people similar to themselves.

Premise 5: The average reproductive success for members of a group is greater than that of humans without a group (e.g. for population of 100 people, 50 collaborating as a group will reproduce more than the 50 non-collaborating).

Contention 3, based on Lemma 1 and Premise 5: Humans have an emotional tendency to desire to belong in a group.

Contention 4, based on Contention 3 and Contention 2: Humans will prefer to desire to belong in a group with genetically similar humans over a group genetically different humans (assuming groups of similar strength).

Corollary 1 to Contention 4: Humans are naturally racist, i.e. more empathic to genetically similar humans and prefer to belong to a genetically similar group.

Corollary 2 to Contention 4: Since the family is the most basic group, preferring to take care of your biological child over other children is the most basic form of racism.

Corollary 3 to Contention 4: The more homogeneous a group (such as a state) is, the more stable it will be.

Corollary 4 to Contention 4: In order to increase a person's empathy to another group show how similar they are to that person. In order to reduce a person's empathy to another group show how different they are to that person.

Comments: While humans will tend to be more empathic to genetically similar humans, other races are genetically similar too. A person of your race has 99% (maybe) similarity and a person of another race has 96% (maybe) similarity. Hence, in the absence of group conflict, there will be natural empathy to people of other races, just a little less. In any case, unless a person poses a danger to your genetic reproduction, hurting another human is always genetically like hurting yourself, since all humans share many genes. Accepting the fact that racism has biological reasons doesn't mean you should be a nazi (this requires seeing other races as very different and as a huge threat...)

In addition, while racism is natural, it is not necessarily beneficial, even from the biological amoral perspective of the red-pill, since many groups today are not racially homogeneous. For example, the U.S. is a group and if the U.S. would have a white-black war the entire U.S. group would suffer. Thus, from the U.S. group perspective racism will have negative repercussions on the U.S. (For example, if white and black people in the U.S. would start kill each other, the U.S. group would be divided to sub-groups and be weaker. A weaker U.S. group would not be able to do stuff like effectively killing brown people.)

Being part of something that doesn't exist

dicipres · 2 August 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

The ongoing and accelerating collapse of the old patriarchal institutions, such as the army, religion and the family is a driving force behind the need of young men for something like the manosphere. The army is no longer defined by heterosexual masculinity and cannot confer masculine status for service. The ancient religions were corrupted in a few decades into feel good everybody gets a medal liberalism. The family is an empty vessel which even if it exists (and for the lower-classes it already doesn't), it can break at a moment and have no actual meaning. The ongoing collapse both liberate us and make us empty. In order to be a complete man, young men try to fill this emptiness themselves, outside of the state and religious controlled arenas. In order to do that a young man needs to be a solider without an army (martial arts), a priest without a religion (the red-pill) and a patriarch without a family (game/PUA). All these subjects are central to the manosphere.

The Essential Laws of the Red Pill

dicipres · 16 August 2013 · Archived copy · Original

(This post is part of the 'Guide to the Young Patriarch.' The current draft of the Guide can be found [here](#).)

We assume that there is no god, or other higher power, and that knowledge of our world can be achieved by observation and deduction. Human beings are viewed as organisms and accordingly, human behavior is a biological function of the human animal. Thus, analysis of human behavior should begin from biologic perspective. From the biological perspective, and specifically from genetics and evolution, we obtain the following simple argument.

Argument 1

- **Premise 1:** Our genes evolved to maximize reproductive success.
- **Premise 2:** Our biology, which is a manifestation of our genes, significantly influences our emotions and desires.
- **The First Law of the Red Pill, Contention 1, based on Premise 1 and Premise 2:** Our biology, emotions and desires developed (by an evolutionary process) as a tool of our genes to facilitate reproduction of genetic data.
- **The Second Law of the Red Pill, Corollary 1 to Contention 1:** We can estimate what emotions a given set of circumstances will create in a human by estimating what emotions and behavior will be optimal for reproduction of genetic data (at the time of the evolutionary development of the genes).
- **The Third Law of the Red Pill, Corollary 2 to Contention 1:** One can create a given emotion in another human if one can create a set of circumstances for which that given emotion will maximize reproduction of genetic data (at the time of the evolutionary development of the genes).

Discussion

While this argument is simple enough, its implications are not widely accepted or understood (perhaps due to habit or emotional distress of accepting the red pill). Essentially, we claim that all human behaviors, such as love, empathy, sexuality, war, family, etc. are to be understood primarily from an evolutionary and biological perspective. This is widely different from the common essential premises used in society. The most common premises guiding the majority of the population are, or at least similar to, the following:

The religious premise: There is a god and human behavior should follow the will of the god.

The humanist premise: Society and human behavior should be such as to minimize human suffering.

The egalitarian premise: Society and human behavior should be such as to minimize inequality between various sub-groups of humans.

The libertarian premise: Society and human behavior should be such as to allow maximal freedom to individual humans.

Unlike the views of majority of the population, the Red-Pill view does not have clear 'good' and 'bad'. Life exists since it creates life, a self-excitation solution of the universe function. The closest thing to such definition of 'good' or 'bad' is reproductive success and reproductive failure, respectively.

This second law of the Red-Pill is the main tool used in this text for predicting and interpreting human behaviors and emotions. However, this approach has limitations. Nature design might be "optimal" (e.g. a fish shape is optimal for swimming in water), however, it is never optimal with regard to a single parameter, but to a wide array of parameters and biological limitations acting on the organism. Not all of these parameters might be obvious and clearly visible. In addition, species are still evolving and many species might be still far from the optimal configuration, thus there might be significant imperfections. Even after taking these limitations into account, this approach is an effective tool to analyze our world and allows for reducing the influence of morality and current governing ideologies on our observations of the world.

The first part of the 'Guide for a Young Patriarch' is finished

dicipres · 31 August 2013 · Archived copy · Original

The first part of the Guide for a Young Patriarch is finished. The first section, entitled simply 'analysis' focuses on applying biological 'red-pill' perspective to understand ourselves, sexual relations and tribalism and includes 12 arguments. The second section will focus on self-growth from the red-pill perspective and I expect it will be finished in a year or so (based on the current rate of progress and my available free time).

You can view or download the first section [here](#). Comments and suggestions are welcomed.

Dicipres

A well spanked wife is a happy wife

dicipres · 26 October 2013 · Archived copy · Original

Spanking your wife/girlfriend is a fun way to communicate dominance (e.g. alpha or lover value) without hurting comfort (e.g. beta or provider value). While many or most of the ways to communicate dominance involve openly stated demonstrations of your higher value (or dark game demonstrations of her lower value) this is on the surface just a sexy game. However, routinely spanking your wife sends her a strong unstated message of dominance, even if the spanking is just a game.

With time your wife will get used to more and more spanking and since her hind-brain will see her husband as her 'spanker' she will see her husband as more alpha. Since her husband is more alpha she will be more happy and satisfied compared with non spanked wives.

(hmm, yes, I spank my wife.)

Read "No More Mr. Nice Guy" by Robert Glover

dicipres · 30 October 2013 · Archived copy · Original

The book "No More Mr. Nice Guy" by Robert Glover had already been recommended by various voices in the manosphere. I recently read it and I fully support including this book into the manosphere bookshelf and I now include this book in my "Education of a Patriarch" book list. Like it or not, some part of the nice guy existed in most of us. The "Nice guy" of Dr. Glover is a coward who believed what he was told and mainly believe that if he will be 'nice' (which is in practice being submissive to others) nice things will happen to him. Unfortunately for him, this is just not true. Also, since **masculinity is dominance**, the nice guy destroys his masculinity and himself in the process of being nice and appeasing others.

It is not a perfect book, and many times the examined cases are too extreme and the suggested solutions are incomplete and whiny, such as "share it with a safe person". In addition Dr. Glover lacks any perspective from evolutionary biology which is a shame but expected. (Personally, I support rearranging the academic departments so that psychology will be a field studied in biology faculties by biologists from an evolutionary biology perspective and thus become a "real" science.)

Even with these limitations, it is a great breakthrough book. It is in essence a moderate version of the manosphere published years before the manosphere came into existence. Dr. Glover insights are relevant more than ever and the ideas he discuss should be studied by young men in the western world. If you seek growth, I highly recommend reading this book.

Misogynists love women more

dicipres · 2 November 2013 · Archived copy · Original

The blue pill view, which is the common view today, and specifically the view of nice guys and male-feminists (which is any blue pill man), sees women as victims and blameless angels. This is how most of society views women. It is the pedestal on which society puts the modern woman. Many young men believe this view and see women as morally superior in every sense and basically believe in women as 'good'. In a way, you can see this when mothers tell their sons "do not hurt women", not "be careful women hurt you" as well as when single mothers are hailed as **heroic and not irresponsible**.

This view is highly detrimental to young men since women, unfortunately, are not blameless angels. When the nice-feminist-guy gets hit with a more realistic view of women (and specifically the promiscuous modern woman which have no moral code other than 'follow your feelings'), the pedestal turns into anger and resentment. The resentment follows naturally from unrealistic expectations and can be observed in most men who begin thinking heretical red pill thoughts. This, initially, can hurt your relationships with women, but the resentment will fade in time while the knowledge will remain.

The red pill eventually results in thinking less of women compared with the common western view and for stating such views you will be label a misogynist. However, the red-pill evo-bio based knowledge of women and their sexuality will actually allow you to love them more and much more honestly than the standard feminist nice guy. A red pill man can understand the deceitful and **concealed nature of female sexuality**, the ruthlessness of **hypergamy**, the **contradictions in their desires**, and understand the moral void in which the modern secular humanist woman exists . He expects no more than is possible and can enjoy the great joy, warmth and passion women, and especially those women with an intact sense of femininity, still offer. In the end, the love of a misogynist is stronger and more honest than the feminist-male love based on a shell of pretty lies.

Economics is Essential Knowledge for a Patriarch

dicipres · 19 November 2013 · Archived copy · Original

"It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest."

Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations, 1776

Due to a recent promotion at work I have much less time to focus on this blog or my other hobbies. Posts are thus more limited in scope and the final version of The Guide for a Young Patriarch will be significantly delayed. I do however still have time to read and recently began reading texts on economics, including the classic book "the wealth of nations."

Books on war are of clear importance to a patriarch since they involve conflict and fight for dominance, which are in the essence of **masculinity** (i.e. both create and emanate from testosterone). The motives to study economics are far less clear and emanate from the solid red-pill observations in the heart of classical economic text. We can see the relation between economics and the red pill when we discuss the sexual market place, or when the economists talk about money as a social contract, or when pre-selection mixes with supply and demand, or when goods are valued due to nothing but scarcity.

To put it bluntly: **If war is the most brutal and honest form of conflict, economics is the most brutal and honest form of human relationships.** I recommend any young patriarch to read at least one fundamental text in classical economics as part of his education (I added recommendations to "**Education of a Patriarch**" reading list and you can check the **Captain's blog**). It will be relevant to much more than just economics since it will give perspective to sexual relationships and other human interactions.

What is Feminism?

dicipres · 25 November 2013 · Archived copy · Original

Feminists will usually define feminism as a somewhat abstract demand to equality and justice between the genders. Any other description of feminism and its effects on society made by non-feminists will be ignored based on “you can’t tell a feminist what feminism is” type arguments. In fact, any social movement will define its values in heroic and moral light but ignore other unwanted effects created by the movement. For example, socialists will define socialism as “social justice” and economic equality while ignoring that socialism is also things like reduced competition and encouraging dependence on the state, etc.

Here are some “other” things that feminism is, beyond the feminist stated goal of equality:

Feminism is a morbidly obese, sexually promiscuous, short-haired, tattooed, cussing beast whom no man can ever love or trust.

Feminism is a family which hates itself.

Feminism is a line drawn inside your home between you and your wife.

Feminism is a woman furious over ‘rape culture’ and who masturbates while fantasizing being beaten and raped.

Feminism is opposing telling girls what they “need” to like (e.g. cooking and dolls) while telling girls what they “need” to like (e.g. engineering and math).

Feminism is a woman who cannot be loved anymore since she hates the domineering man she lusts and sexually despises the submissive man she likes.

Feminism is alimony and every other weekend

Feminism is a son hating his father

Feminism is equality as the only measure for progress of a society

Feminism (and MRAs) is nationalism applied to gender

Feminism is more and more laws to force reality fit feminist ideals

Feminism is a demographic annihilation due to low birth rates

Feminism is destruction of the most fundamental unit of society

Feminism is nationalism applied to gender

dicipres · 3 December 2013 · Archived copy · Original

This is a continuation of the previous post. Yet another video of feminists/progressives increasingly acting more and more radical, it is almost unbelievable in a way, and it only gets worse. You could easily replace the gender cause with nationalistic ideals. This is not about making the world a 'better' place, this is tribalism, us and them, dividing a society from within based on an arbitrary demand for equality between groups which are not actually equal in the statistical sense. Eliminating such behaviors is not an easy task. The first response many individuals exposed to the emotions and behavior of feminists is to become MRAs, but MRAs are essentially more of the same. Feminism creates MRAs and MRAs create feminists just like any nationalism creates more nationalism.

In the context of general progressives and racialism, equality of groups requires defining who is in the group and who is not. Who is white and who is black, etc. Equality of groups also assumes that people of a given group are responsible to acts committed by others from that group, even if done in different place and time. Equality of groups requires well defined racial identities where everyone is assigned to a race. Ironically, the most common and effective motivation for racial identities comes from the equality crowd.

MRM and the Patriarch

dicipres · 13 December 2013 · Archived copy · Original

In one of my [previous posts](#) I compared the MRM to feminism. While I mainly criticized feminism, the comparison to the MRM was a clear criticism of the MRM.

A reader by the handle Thanatos commented:

"You might need some MRAs and/or nationalists to back you up here. You appear to be nearly outgunned by your detractors on your own blog. Without a robust MRM, there can be no manosphere. You cannot talk about these subjects without our praetorian guard (who need to get back to their more radical roots, for sure) to hollow out a space in which to do so. Your ideas might stand on their own, but they don't defend themselves, and you can't defend them from pink fascism alone.

Try to build a stronger network and better relations with your peers, regardless of whether you agree with every jot and tittle of their belief system. It has a synergistic effect which strengthens all of us.

To be free of pink fascism, we must annihilate its traditional basis, its foundation. Every soldier in this cause helps, whether he is MRA, nationalist, or what-have-you. Build networks with those attacking the foundations of pink fascism, consciously or unconsciously, and when they have mortally wounded it and it is on the decline, THEN you can afford to be picky.

The only ones we should be avoiding or ostracizing are those that tend to manginism, which undermines our efforts, or towards some flavor of pink fascism, e.g. "social justice" activists, etc. These we must utterly isolate from their allies and any form of aid or comfort, to wither in the dark."

I completely agree with Thanatos. Using some sort of gender-based 'tribalism' will definitely be more effective in achieving change (as is the case with feminism), and specifically in affecting policy makers. However, in order to achieve policy change it is also beneficial to present yourself as a victim, to cry equality over various subjects (work fatalities, women raping men, etc.) where the genders are not actually equal and more. All these are actually detrimental to a clear view of the world and to the essence of young men.

Basically:

1. The interests of men as a group sometimes might be in conflict with the interest of a specific man.
2. To 'win' in politics you must become a politician and distort reality to support your view.

While I support the goal of eliminating feminist 'nationalism', the focus of this work is on patriarchal virtues. I do not wish to undermine the MRA and I support opposing feminism. However, a clear view of the world and growth of individual man will be prioritized.

Strength Training is an Essential Knowledge for a Patriarch

dicipres · 14 December 2013 · Archived copy · Original

Physical training is of importance to any person due to health reasons, effects on mental abilities, delay in effects of aging, physical attractiveness and more. Strength training and body building are of significant interest to the Patriarch since they are strongly related to masculinity (i.e. both emanates and create testosterone) and since muscles have a primal psychological effect on a man power and ability to physical violence. It is thus important that a young Patriarch will be well-informed in the proper methods and biology of strength training and I thus very strongly advise any young Patriarch to read on physical exercise and strength training.

For the past six months I am training according to the book “Body by Science” by John Little and I fully recommend this book. Accordingly this is the first fitness book added to the “[Education of a Patriarch](#)” list. The method suggested in this book has the benefit of being short in required time and yet very effective.

Make sure you study the proper methods to train and preserve you body. Read a book on fitness and strength training and apply it.

I hate disabled people

dicipres · 5 January 2014 · Archived copy · Original

I am currently struggling with writing about tribalism. I am not sure when the post will be finished, and the more I think about tribalism the more I see tribalism in everything from genes, to religions, to politics, etc. Also, I see hypocrisy from all directions of the political map and it is very challenging to look on tribalism without emotions regarding my own tribalism. So... the next post may take a while to finish.

In the meanwhile, I have a personal anecdote which may indicate the future direction of the liberal academic teachings. I recently 'argued' with a easy-going feminist who is a graduate student on the subject of disabilities. (I didn't have any expectations for actual discussion, but this feminist is actually pretty friendly and civil and I am interested in being up-to-date with non-internet academic BS.)

The conversation was something like the following:

Her argument: The current academic theory on disability is that **disabled people are only disabled due to social constructs**. If society was constructed differently they will be able to do everything that able-body people can do. Society must ensure equality and be redesigned so that disabled people can do everything able-body people can. Discrimination against the disabled must end.

My argument: People are not equal. Society should try to help the disabled, but we shouldn't enforce equality. Society should be constructed to optimize allocation of the resources for everybody's benefit, not to force unequal people to be equal. (I gave an example of a university course which in order to be 'equal' needs significant funds to cater each possible kind of disability, which in turn lowers the quality of the course for most people.)

Her second argument: Wow, I knew you hate feminists and liberals, but I didn't know **you hate disabled people, wow**.

Imagine two researchers arguing about quantum theory and one answers the other by "you hate quantum theory." I wish the disabled the best and I love all people, I really do. However, I respect humanity less and less each day... most people are just emotional junkies. The greatest gift of mankind, the ability to think, is just a tool for them manipulate in order to feel good about oneself.

(Note, she said 'wow' twice, just like the internet feminists. I guess it is truly amazing to her that people with my opinions exist in 2014.)

A Deceleration of Defection

dicipres · 21 January 2014 · Archived copy · Original

My journey into becoming a thinking man began almost ten years ago. This journey was initially inspired by an angst to fulfill sexual desires. I wanted to understand in order to achieve a goal. I began this journey as a 'good' hopeless romantic man with awkward and ineffective interactions with women. I ended a bad man without any romanticism who easily attracts young women. I did achieved the goal I wanted, but the process changed who I am. As I dismantled the lies I dismantled my old self. Today I see society, morality and sexual relations just as interactions between genes and memes. I see emotions as the tools of the genes. I have no illusions that love, family or tribalism are more than that. While it is easy to agree with these facts on the surface, understanding the full implications of these facts is much darker.

I was not the only one changing. Society was changing too and destroyed things my old self cared most about. Young me used to care greatly about masculine institutions (e.g. army) and family. Both lost most of their meaning today. Our times today are times of social atomization, ending of social institutions, degradation of honor and glorification of weakness. The exact opposite of masculinity and family.

The more I look the more I understand that I have nearly nothing in common with the people around me. There is nothing in modern culture to believe in. There is nothing in modern culture that I am a part of. There is no ground to stand on anymore and when there is no ground to stand on we must learn to fly. We must defect from the sinking ground and allow ourselves to be completely different from the people around us.

Steinbeck's observations on men and women

dicipres · 25 January 2014 · Archived copy · Original

The beginning of 'Grapes of Wrath' includes the following paragraph, very interesting from the red-pill/dark enlightenment perspective. This paragraph follows a description of a severe drought ruining crops.

"Men stood by their fences and looked at the ruined corn, drying fast now, only a little green showing through the film of dust. The men were silent and they did not move often. And the women came out of the houses to stand beside their men—to feel whether this time the men would break. The women studied the men's faces secretly, for the corn could go, as long as something else remained. The children stood near by, drawing figures in the dust with bare toes, and the children sent exploring senses out to see whether men and women would break. The children peeked at the faces of the men and women, and then drew careful lines in the dust with their toes. Horses came to the watering troughs and nuzzled the water to clear the surface dust. After a while the faces of the watching men lost their bemused perplexity and became hard and **angry and resistant**. **Then the women knew that they were safe** and that there was no break. Then they asked, What'll we do? And the men replied, I don't know. But it was all right. The women knew it was all right, and the watching children knew it was all right. **Women and children knew deep in themselves that no misfortune was too great to bear if their men were whole.**" [emphasis mine]

John Steinbeck describes several patterns in the society of his time (this was written in 1939). 1. Women and children rely on men, 2. Women are testing men to see if they are strong or weak, 3. Women feel safe near 'angry and resistant' men and 4. The relation between men and women is similar to the relation between women and children. This is just another example that the red-pill is not in any way new. We are just rediscovering what was meant to be forgotten. Fortunately, while the modern PC-machine can control new publications, they cannot change old books. (It is reasonable that such books will be, at least, ignored in the future, if not banned.)

Such a 'sexist' paragraph could have not been published today and I wonder what the 'modern' Steinbeck would write. I suppose that the modern version of Steinbeck would replace the first sentence by

"Heroic single moms stood by their fences and looked at the ruined corn, drying fast now, and waited to get new child-support corn and alimony corn with government corn supplements."

(Since most modern food is just processed corn, this is actually pretty accurate). The last sentence would be modified to

"Women and children knew deep in themselves that no misfortune was too great to bear if the government is whole and can put baby-daddies in prison if they don't pay up corn."

The middle would just be deleted.

The latest version of the Guide for a Young Patriarch

dicipres · 30 March 2014 · Archived copy · Original

I updated and revised the Guide for a Young Patriarch. The latest version of the guide can be found [here](#) in A5 format and [here](#) in A4 format. Feedback and comments are welcomed.

Dicipres